**The Dissertation Committee for David Marcus Lauderback**
**Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:**

# The U.S. Army School of the Americas:

# Mission and Policy during the Cold War

**Committee:**

_____
Robert A. Divine, Supervisor

_____
Michael B. Stoff, Co-Supervisor

_____
Virginia Garrard Burnett

_____
Mark A. Lawrence

_____
H. W. Brands

# The U.S. Army School of the Americas:

# Mission and Policy during the Cold War

by

David Marcus Lauderback, A.B., M.A.

## Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

## Doctor of Philosophy

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**December 2004**

# Dedication

To Laura

You finally earned your Ph.T.

## Acknowledgments

This project began with a suggestion: "How about the School of the Americas?" The counterinsurgency and intelligence manuals that the U.S. Army had used for years to train Latin American military students at Ft. Gulick and at Ft. Benning had just been made public, prompting a spate of media coverage. One evening while watching the news, my father-in-law, Joseph Di Pasquale, posed the query to me, the spouse of his eldest daughter. I am sure he remarked in idle interest, wondering aloud about prospective dissertation topics. I did not have to think very long. "That fits," I replied. I had been looking for an interpretative wedge with which to explore U.S.-Latin American relations during the cold war, and the school seemed ideal. Thanks Joe. So off I went. Along the way I have received continual support from all the usual suspects, as well as the generous help of strangers.

Next, I must thank the librarians and archivists who made this effort possible. "The researcher is only as good as the archivist," is a maxim that ought to be emblazoned in libraries and archives around the globe. I am indebted to many able professionals who work the repositories from which I drew the story recounted here. Jorge and staff keep the Benson Latin American Collection at the University of Texas at Austin the finest

single repository of Latin American literature in the world. Mary Haynes, Andrew Birtle and the excellent people at the Center for Military History introduced me to the world of military history. Yamill Collazo and Lt. Col. Russell Ramsay (ret.) opened the doors at the John B. Amos library at Ft. Benning and gave me free run of the copier. Wil Mahoney, senior military archivist at the National Archives in College Park, Maryland, not only helped me navigate the vast collection of the United States Army, he even plumbed the depths of the vaults to find – and declassify on the spot – additional materials pertaining specifically to the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The folks at the Kennedy Library provided monies to help fund my research, and Will Johnson personally selected boxes he knew I needed to examine. The staff in Abilene kept their doors open extra just for me (and a few other intransigent graduate students, late one Saturday afternoon – my last in Kansas), giving me time to find the documents connecting President Eisenhower to counterinsurgency training at Ft. Gulick. And Oscar Osorio let me paw through his personal files on U.S. counterinsurgency policy in Central America, which he continues to compile for his work at the National Security Archive at Georgetown.

Good folks I met along the way took care of me in ways that I will never forget. Bill and Mary Lammert opened their home to me, fed me, and when the good folks of Enterprise, Kansas called wondering why I was out running in the late afternoon heat, they explained that I was from California by way of Texas. The ladies at Popeye's across the street from Ft. Benning made sure that an extra biscuit, a wing or a leg, some extra

slaw or mashers always made its way into my Special #3. And, they directed me to the best breakfast this white boy has ever eaten. Tan at General Tso's remained open late every night for three weeks so I could stay at the Archives until closing and still get a "hot meal." And when the canteen at the Kennedy Library discovered how much I enjoyed the chowder and corn beef, it became the "special" every day for two weeks. Finally, the hard-working folks at the National Archives let me pull extra trucks and even helped me copy the counterinsurgency manuals I found just hours before my flight was to leave National.

My teachers have trained, inspired, and, when necessary, cajoled me as well. Peter Cleaves, Henry Selby, Aline Helg, Susan Deans Smith, Jonathan Brown, and Richard Graham never seemed to lose their bemused expression at the Americanist who took Latin American history so seriously. Bob Olwell, Gunther Peck, and Kevin Kenny pushed me to stretch my analytical muscles, and Dave Bowman, Sally Clarke, and Howard Miller showed me more than a bit about teaching. Neil Heyman and Arthur Schatz taught me look for a conclusion soundly rooted in the evidence rather than just an idea that sounds good. Jess Stoddart never missed an opportunity to give me insight into the life of the professional historian. And Brian Loveman, Ernst Griffin, Norris Clement, and Thomas Davies, Jr., nurtured in me a desire to understand the historical basis of U.S.-Latin American relations at a time when rhetoric was pandemic and comprehension rare.

My committee stood behind me during this entire project, offering the benefit of their experience and showing great patience. Michael Stoff kept the wolves that doubted

at bay when health and family issues slowed my progress; Mark Lawrence offered camaraderie and insight; Ginny Burnett helped balance my perspective; Bill Brands stepped in at the last minute; and Bob Divine stood by me longer than any of us ever expected he would need to.

And Mary Helen Quinn and Marilyn Lehman ably worked the bureaucracy that is The University of Texas at Austin.

Finally, my family has offered continual support and encouragement over the years. To my father Delaney and his wife Engeltie Lauderback, thank you for your faith, and for the lap top on which the dissertation found its voice; to my mother Stephanie Riegel, you are right, writing generates its own momentum; to my brother and sister Don and Justine who offered constant, if bewildered (why would you do this to yourself!), affection, "it's done"; to Joe, mon beau-frère: c'est finis; to my brother- and sisters-in-law Joe, Cathy, Ellen and Alicia, thank you for your encouragement and occasional prodding; to my godchildren, Ashley, Jean, Tad, Alexis, Ichiro, Juliette, Ben, and John, always pursue your dreams. And, a final note of gratitude to Dan Waldorf, who made sure that I went to graduate school.

To everyone: thank you.

DML

August, 2004

# The U.S. Army School of the Americas:

# Mission and Policy during the Cold War

Publication No. _____

David Marcus Lauderback, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2004

Supervisors: Robert A. Divine and Michael B. Stoff

The Cuban Revolution was the watershed of U.S.-Latin American relations in the cold war and led a generation of policymakers to work assiduously to prevent its recurrence. The U.S. Army School of the Americas became a small part of a systemic effort by the United States to provide Latin America with the skills to enforce internal security and stymie Communist subversion. The United States Army in 1939 had begun a series of informal training sessions with Latin American soldiers and officers designed to promote regional cooperation in the years leading to World War II. A decade later, the

U.S. Army established a formal training center at Ft. Gulick at the eastern edge of the zone and named it the U.S. Army Caribbean School. When the Kennedy administration renamed the training facility at Ft. Gulick in 1963, the U.S. Army School of the Americas had already served thousands of Latin American military for over two decades. Despite the new name, however, the school quickly returned to its subordinate position in the U.S. Army's training and doctrine command as subsequent presidents concentrated on Vietnam, the Soviet Union, and the nuclear arms race. The unsavory legacy of U.S. policy in Central America during the 1980s led critics in the 1990s to dub the facility, now at Ft. Benning, Georgia, the "School of Assassins" and demand its closure. But the school rarely played more than a tangential role in U.S. policy. Instead, the United States preferred to use military missions and special forces teams to reinforce authoritarian rule in Latin America. And administration after administration bolstered and even installed dictatorships because they believed that only the region's military were capable of maintaining order and protecting American interests. The literature of the period explains U.S. policy as either the result of national security concerns or the product of advancing economic imperialism. Examining the history of the U.S. Army School of the Americas, however, reveals that the focus on the security/economics dynamic has effectively obscured the legacy of American paternalism on United States foreign and military relations with Latin America.

## Table of Contents

# Introduction:

## Frederick Winslow Taylor, Antonio Gramsci, and Walt W. Rostow:

## The Social Construction of Development and

## the U.S. Army School of the Americas

On July 1, 1963, John F. Kennedy renamed the inter-American military training facility in Panama to reflect his desire to combat Communist subversion in the hemisphere: the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The United States Army in 1939 had begun a series of informal training sessions with Latin American soldiers and officers designed to promote regional cooperation in the years leading to World War II. A decade later the U.S. Army established a formal training center at Ft. Gulick at the eastern edge of the zone and named it the U.S. Army Caribbean School. The school worked during the 1950s to create an identity as a facility for Latin American military, including a switch in 1956 to instruction in Spanish. The army, however, preferred to employ its missions to American embassies to train foreign nationals in the host country. The Cuban Revolution would change the mission at the school because it soon raised the specter of Communist subversion in the hemisphere, and successive administrations worked assiduously to prevent its reoccurrence. President Kennedy launched the Alliance for Progress to induce economic development in the underdeveloped economies of Latin America. When the Kennedy administration renamed the training facility at Ft. Gulick, the U.S. Army School of the Americas had already served thousands of Latin American military for over two decades. The school had become part of a broad program

designed to impart specialized counterinsurgency training to assist regional military in maintaining internal security in their countries so that development could continue apace. Despite the new name, however, the School of the Americas quickly returned to its subordinate position in the U.S. Army's training and doctrine command as subsequent presidents concentrated on Vietnam, the Soviet Union, and the nuclear arms race. This changed during the first half of the 1980s when the Reagan administration catapulted the school to the front lines of U.S. policy in Central America as the primary training facility for the El Salvadoran Army. The unsavory legacy of that period led critics in the 1990s to dub the facility, now at Ft. Benning, Georgia, the "School of Assassins" and demand its closure. Now, with a new name once again, the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation touts itself as a leading force for human rights and counternarcotics training.

The U.S. Army School of the Americas provides a useful tool to examine United States foreign and military policy toward Latin America after 1939. American intervention – political, military, and economic – has marked relations between the United States and the nations of Latin America. The literature on U.S.-Latin American relations during this period, and on the cold war in general, alternatively depicts American policy as the result of advancing economic hegemony, or the product of evolving security considerations within the context of the cold war. Those few historians who have addressed U.S. training of Latin American military generally conclude that it did indeed promote a new emphasis on counterinsurgency tactics to provide internal political stability deemed essential for underdeveloped Latin American nations to develop

the economic and political preconditions necessary for democratic institutions to take hold. Examining the School of the Americas's evolving mission provides a unique opportunity to explore the changing assumptions, tactics, and purpose of U.S. Latin American policy during the cold war. Further, telling the history of the School in its various incarnations since 1939 offers the chance to illuminate a much discussed but little understood part of the role of the United States Army in American foreign relations. It also affords the opportunity to address the impact of that training on Latin America.

The United States used military assistance and training to reinforce authoritarian and military rule in Latin America. The Soviet Union, not Latin America, mattered to the United States during the cold war. The contestation with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics preoccupied the attention of successive presidents in the four and one-half decades after World War II. Asia required the concerted attention of several administrations, but only on two occasions did Latin America warrant a measure of the same concern: after the Cuban and Nicaraguan Revolutions. The United States did its best to ignore Latin America as a rule and expected that the region would not distract the world's first nuclear power from pursuing the containment of international Communism. To ensure that no disruptions occurred, presidents during the cold war chose to support Latin American dictatorships in order to ensure order and stability. Administration after administration – with the qualified exception of Jimmy Carter – reinforced that policy through the Military Assistance Program. The U.S. armed forces provided the world with materiel and training from the world's most powerful military. Latin American military eagerly accepted that aid, clamored for more, and embraced the training the United States

offered. When the Kennedy and Reagan administrations believed that popular uprisings in Cuba and Nicaragua represented a Communist incursion into the Western Hemisphere, and portended further subversion, the U.S. Army offered counterinsurgency training to enhance the ability of the Latin American military to preserve internal security in their own countries. The United States knew the long history of intervention by the Latin American military into their domestic politics. But administration after administration bolstered and even installed dictatorships because they believed that only the region's military were capable of maintaining order and protecting American interests. The presidents of the cold war decided to privilege authoritarianism in Latin America because the men who served in the Oval Office accepted the responsibility to procure markets for United States business as well as preserve national security against Communism. But they also shared America's deeply embedded racial paternalism, which shaped the course and content of U.S. policy toward Latin America.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

United States policy toward Latin America has involved repeated military, political, and economic intervention in the region. Critics of U.S. policy toward Latin America believe the foundation for American intervention rests with the mistaken conviction that the Monroe Doctrine has a "positive legacy." The United States, they contend, has relied on a discourse predicated on the assumption that intervention is in the interest of all of the Americas. Further, successive presidential administrations have never seriously examined the persistent sense of entitlement that has historically directed policy toward the region. With an often high-handed paternalism, the United States took

over one-half of Mexico's territory in 1848 and periodically dallied with adding Caribbean countries as states during the nineteenth century. The United States capped off the century by sending troops to "free" the Cubans from the clutches of Spanish brutality in that "splendid little war" in 1898. Congress pushed through the Teller (1898) and Platt (1903) Amendments which kept Cuba out of the United States but properly subordinate by law to congressional mandate, leaving Cubans only a semblance of autonomy until 1933. The United States also intervened militarily and occupied several nations in the Caribbean and Central America in the first decades of the twentieth century. But first Herbert Hoover and then, more definitively, Franklin D. Roosevelt rejected military intervention and occupation and sought the good will of the nations of Latin America, the latter in an effort to forestall German and British economic and political influence in the region and promote American trade. Concern for national security shaped policy during World War II and the cold war that followed. Following the war and into the 1950s, and again in the 1970s, the United States simply sought to maintain a status quo in which it enjoyed the generally staunch support of authoritarian leaders in the region, and American investment benefited from salutary political relations. As in the 1920s, American investment bankers in the 1970s pursued Latin American markets with a vengeance and captured the lion's share of the investment capital markets. The ebb and flow of security, then economic, then security concerns, has fostered the perception that American intervention has been directed, alternatively, by these forces. But rather than

acting as contending imperatives, economic and security considerations have reinforced each other in shaping American foreign policy.[1]

---

[1] Eldon Kenworthy, America/Américas: Myth in the Making of U.S. Policy toward Latin America (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 1-12; and Salvador de Madariaga, Latin America between the Eagle and the Bear (New York: Praeger, 1962), 74, chastise the United States for the presumed beneficent legacy of the Monroe doctrine. On the making of the Monroe Doctrine, see Ernest R. May, The Making of the Monroe Doctrine (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975); Samuel Flagg Bemis, John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Diplomacy (New York: Knopf, 1949); Dexter Perkins, The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1937); and Bradford Perkins, Castlereagh and Adams (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964). See Kenworthy, America/Américas; Clara Nieto, Masters of War: Latin America and U.S. Aggression from the Cuban Revolution through the Clinton Years (New York: Seven Stories, 2003); and Arturo Escobar, Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), on the "discourse" of development. For the Mexican War see Jack K. Bauer, The Mexican War, 1846-1848, intro. Robert W. Johnson (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974); Richard Griswold del Castillo, The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: A Legacy of Conflict (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990); Thomas R. Heitala, Manifest Design: Anxious Aggrandizement in Late Jacksonian America (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986); and David M. Pletcher, The Diplomacy of Annexation: Texas, Oregon, and the Mexican War (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973). For nineteenth-century U.S.-Caribbean expansion, see David M. Pletcher, The Awkward Years: American Foreign Policy under Garfield and Arthur (Colombia: University of Missouri Press, 1962); idem, The Diplomacy of Trade and Investment: American Investment in the Hemisphere, 1865-1900 (Colombia: University Press, 1998); Philip S. Foner, A History of Cuba and Its Relations with the United States vol. I, 1492-1845: From the Conquest of Cuba to La Escalera (New York: International, 1962); Walter LaFeber, The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963); Robert E. May, The Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire, 1854-1861 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973); and Josef Opatrny, United States Expansionism and Cuban Annexationism in the 1850s (Prague: Charles University, 1990). Discussion of the U.S. role in Cuba in 1898 begins with H. Wayne Morgan, America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion (New York: Wiley, 1965); Philip S. Foner, Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of American Imperialism, 1895-1898, 2 vols. (New York: Monthly Review, 1972); Julio Le Riverend, La república: dependencia y revolución, 4th ed. rev. (Havana: Instituto Cubano Libro, 1975); José M. Hernández, Cuba and the United States: Intervention and Militarism, 1868-1933 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993); John L. Offner, An Unwanted War: The Diplomacy of the United States and Spain Over Cuba (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); and Aline Helg, Our Rightful Share: The Afro-Cuban Struggle for Equality, 1886-1912 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995). For U.S. intervention in the Caribbean and Central America, see Max Boot, The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 129-252; Lester Langley, The Banana Wars: United States Intervention in the Caribbean, 1898-1934 (Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1983); Thomas Schoonover, The United States in Central America, 1860-1911: Episodes of Imperialism and Imperial Rivalry in the World System (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991); Richard H. Collin, Theodore Roosevelt's Caribbean: The Panama Canal, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Latin American Context (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988); and David Healy, Driven to Hegemony: The United States in the Caribbean, 1889-1917 (Madison: University of Wisconsin, Press, 1988). For specific cases see Hans Schmidt, The United States Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934, foreword Stephen Solarz (New Brunzwick: Rutgers University Press, 1995). [1971]; Brenda Gayle Plummer, Haiti and the Great Power, 1902-1915 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992); and Neil Macaulay, The Sandino Affair (Chicago: Quadrangle,

The intersection of economic and security concerns shaped American foreign policy most strongly during the cold war. The United States emerged from World War II as the world's preeminent economic and military power. The emerging cold war with the Soviet Union dominated the concerns of policymakers, profoundly interacted with domestic life, and reinforced the nation's diplomatic and economic east-west orientation. A strategy of global "containment" of Communism and the Soviet Union came to direct U.S. foreign policy. The United States in the years after World War II concentrated on a divided Europe. The Marshall Plan represents a classic example of the intersection of economic and security concerns, as the United States worked to deny further Communist political gains in Europe by promoting the faltering economies of pro-western nations. In doing so, the Marshall Plan secured the crucial markets of Europe for the United States. Marshall, however, abruptly told Latin Americans in 1948 that, despite their sacrifices during the war (Latin America had provided the United States critical raw materials at below-market prices), the trade package the region believed the United States had promised would not be forthcoming. Instead, the United States pushed a mutual security alliance for the hemisphere. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower limited Latin America's

---

1967); Robert E. Quirk, An Affair of Honor: Woodrow Wilson and the Occupation of Veracruz (New York: Norton, 1962); and Frederich Katz, The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, the United States, and the Mexican Revolution (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981). Combined, Jonathan Brown, Oil and Revolution in Mexico (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); and Linda B. Hall, Oil, Banks, and Politics: The United States and Postrevolutionary Mexico (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995), provide a thorough accounting of the United States, oil barons, and the Mexican Revolution. Frank D. McCann, Jr., The Brazilian-American Alliance, 1937-1945 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), traces the growing concern for German economic ties to South America. For the 1970s private investment explosion, see Barbara Stallings, Banker to the World: U.S. Portfolio Investment in Latin America 1900-1986 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

responsibilities to maintaining political stability and hemispheric defense. In practice, the hemispheric defense policy of the 1940s and 1950s meant U.S. control of the Panama Canal and the shipping lanes of the Caribbean; stability meant political order and no hint of Communism in Latin American governments. When the socialist regime of nationalist Jacabo Arbenz threatened U.S. interests in Guatemala, President Eisenhower moved swiftly, if clandestinely, to oust him. American policymakers relegated Latin America to a comfortably secure backwater, one of some strategic importance, but not the primary battlefield in the war against Communism. It was not until Vice President Richard Nixon's ill-fated trip to South America in 1958 that President Eisenhower began to reconsider America's unswerving support for virulently anti-Communist authoritarian regimes. But it was the Cuban Revolution that refocused the attention of policymakers on Latin America.[2]

---

[2] See John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), pushes the articulation of "containment" over time. See also William Williams, The Tragedy of American Diplomacy (Cleveland: World Publication, 1959); Walter LaFeber, America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1992, 7th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993); Robert A. Divine, Since 1945: Politics and Diplomacy in Recent American History, 3d ed. (New York: Knopf, 1985); Stephen Ambrose, The Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy since 1938, 6th ed. (New York: Penguin, 1991); and Peter G. Boyle, American-Soviet Relations: From the Russin Revolution to the Fall of Communism (London: Routlidge, 1993), for American foreign policy in the cold war. For the origins of the cold war see Norman Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy, 1945-1960 (New York: Anvil, 1962); Thomas G. Paterson, On Every Front: The Making of the Cold War (New York: Norton, 1979); Daniel Yergin, Shattered Peace: The Origins of the Cold War (New York: Penguin, 1990), [1979]; John Lewis Gaddis, The United States and the Origins of the Cold War (New York: Columbia University Pres, 1972); Lloyd Gardner, Architects of Illusion: Men and Ideas in American Foreign Policy, 1941-1949 (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970); Melvyn P. Leffler, A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991); and Caroline Kennedy-Pipe, Stalin's Cold War: Soviet Strategies in Europe, 1943 to 1956 (New York: Manchester University Press, 1995). See John Gimbel, Origins of the Marshall Plan (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976); Michael J. Hogan, The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); and David Lauderback, The War Scare of March 1948:Domestic Considerations and Popular Perceptions of the Soviet Threat, Master's Report, University of Texas at Austin, 1996, for the intersection of domestic and foreign

The Cuban Revolution proved to be the watershed of U.S.-Latin American relations in the cold war. Cuba became the focal point of world attention as the United States and the Soviet Union played a dangerous game of brinkmanship during the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. But Cuban subversion represented the most persistent threat to the United States. America's initial uncertainty about the ramifications of Fidel Castro's revolt against the U.S.-backed dictator, Fulgencio Batista, gave way by mid-1960 to a conviction that Castro must go. The newly-elected President Kennedy carried through with an ill-conceived effort to oust Castro with the invasion of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs that same year. The failure of the attack proved that the United States must contain Communism in the Western Hemisphere. Kennedy declared that the Cuban Revolution represented a challenge that could not be ignored, and he launched an ambitious but ill-fated aid program for Latin America designed to promote economic development and prevent further Communist subversion. However short-lived, the Alliance for Progress included a critical and lasting new component for U.S. foreign and military policy – counterinsurgency training. Even though the Vietnam War quickly removed Latin America from major consideration for policymakers, for the next two

---

policy and the making of the Economic Recovery Plan. David Green, The Containment of Latin America: A History of the Myths and Realities of the Good Neighbor Policy (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971); and Frederico Gil, Latin American-United States Relations (San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1971), examine the United States' emerging Latin American policy during the early cold war. For the range of interpretations on U.S. intervention in Guatemala in 1954, see Richard H. Immerman, The CIA in Guatemala: The Foreign Policy of Intervention (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982); Stephen Schlesinger and Stephen Kinzer, Bitter Fruit: The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala (New York: Anchor, 1983), [1982]; Peiro Glejeises, Shattered Hope: The Guatemalan Revolution and the United States, 1944-1954 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); and Ronald Schneider, Communism in Guatemala (New York: Octagon, 1979).

decades the United States concentrated on providing the Latin American military with military assistance and training necessary to ensure internal security in their countries. The Latin American armed services eagerly embraced the aid, employed counterinsurgency training, and launched a series of long-lasting and brutal military regimes. The Nicaraguan revolution of 1979 became the next watershed for U.S.-Latin American relations. When Ronald Reagan took office in 1981, this ardent cold warrior invigorated the cold war with new fervor for anti-Communism and waged a concerted campaign to topple this latest Communist threat with renewed counterinsurgency aid and training for Central America. The toppling of the Berlin Wall in 1989, however, effectively ended the cold war, and U.S.-Latin American relations have entered a new era that is increasingly reminiscent of the Good Neighbor Policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt.[3]

---

[3] See Peter Wyden, Bay of Pigs: The Untold Story (New York: Touchstone, 1979); and Trumbull Higgins, The Perfect Failure: Kennedy, Eisenhower, and the CIA at the Bay of Pigs (New York: Norton, 1989). For the Cuban Missile Crisis, start with Robert F. Kennedy, Thirteen Days (New York: Norton, 1971); Elie Abel, The Missile Crisis (Philadelphia 1966); Graham T. Allison, Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis (Boston: Brown & Little, 1971); Ronald R. Pope, ed., Soviet Views on the Cuban Missile Crisis: Myth and Reality in Foreign Policy Analysis (Washington: University Press of America, 1982); Robert A. Divine, ed., The Cuban Missile Crisis, 2d ed. (New York: M. Weiner, 1988); John C. Ausland, Kennedy, Khrushchev, and the Berlin-Cuba Crisis, 1961-1964 (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1996); and Mark J, White, The Cuban Missile Crisis (London: MacMillan, 1996). For the American response to the Cuban revolution, see Richard Welch, Response to Revolution: The United States and the Cuban Revolution (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985); Jules R. Benjamin, The United States and the Origins of the Cuban Revolution: An Empire of Liberty in an Age of National Liberation (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); Robert E. Quirk, Fidel Castro (New York: Norton, 1993); and Thomas G. Paterson, Contesting Castro: The United States and the Triumph of the Cuban Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994). On the Cuban revolution, see Hugh Thomas, The Cuban Revolution (New York: Harper & Row, 1977); Ramón Eduardo Ruíz, Cuba: The Making of a Revolution (New York: Norton, 1968); Marifeli Pérez-Stable, The Cuban Revolution: Origins, Course, and Legacy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). On U.S.-Cuban relations since 1959, see Morris H. Morley, Imperial State and Revolution: The United States and Cuba, 1952-1986 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Louis A. Peréz, Cuba and the United States: Ties of Singular Intimacy, 1952-1986 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990); and Wayne S. Smith, The Closest of Enemies: A Personal and Diplomatic Account of U.S.-Cuban Relations since 1957 (New York: Norton, 1987). For the Alliance for Progress, see William D. Rogers, The Twilight Struggle: The Alliance for Progress and the

Making sense of the U.S. Army School of the Americas in this history is hampered by the limited attention it has received in the historical literature. Students of U.S.-Latin American relations have argued back and forth for decades, contending either that U.S. policy toward Latin America reflects the legitimate security concerns of the nation or, instead, that it represents the outgrowth of American economic imperialism. The debate still resonates with the seminal 1943 work of Samuel Flagg Bemis. Bemis forcefully denied that a charge of economic imperialism could be applied to the United States despite the dominating influence of American commercial interests in certain Latin American industries. Bemis was more than a bit disingenuous when he argued that the United States had not used its power to enforce those discrepancies, but he correctly noted that the governments of the region themselves permitted and even encouraged American investment. Bemis could not restrain his overt nationalism, however, when he concluded that the expansion of U.S. interests in the hemisphere represented the natural outgrowth of the continental expansion that had marked the American experience, and that it represented the natural rise of the United States as a world leader. Since then,

---

Politics of Development in Latin America (New York: Random House, 1967); and Jerome I. Levinson and Juan de Onis, The Alliance that Lost Its Way: A Critical Report on the Alliance for Progress (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970). John A. Booth, The End and the Beginning: The Nicaraguan Revolution (Boulder: Westview, 1982); "Nicaragua," in Ché Guevara, Guerrilla Warfare, eds. Brian Loveman and Thomas M. Davies, Jr. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985), 351-390; Walter LaFeber, Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America, 2d rev. ed. (New York: Norton, 1992), 225-241; and John H. Coatsworth, Central America and the United States: The Clients and the Colossus (New York: Twayne, 1994), 137-146, trace war and U.S. policy in Central America in the late 1970s and into the 1980s. For Ronald Reagan, the new cold war, and Central America, see Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Dictatorships and Double Standards: Rationalism and Reason in Politics (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982); Marvin E. Gettleman. et al., eds., El Salvador in the New Cold War (New York: Grove Press, 1981); James Dunkerley, The Long War: Dictatorship and Revolution in El Salvador (London: Junction, 1982); LaFeber, Inevitable Revolution, 242-338; and Coatsworth, Central America and the United States, 163-206.

historians have sallied back and forth, with some explaining U.S.-Latin American policy as merely the extension of American economic hegemony while others have argued that perceived security threats in the midst of the cold war dominated those policy considerations. The debate over the Good Neighbor Policy, for example, has flowed between the two poles, with Gardner, Green, and Gellman highlighting the active part played by the United States government in procuring markets for American economic interests, and Hagelund, Wood, and DeConde stressing the strategic necessity of securing the region's goodwill after decades of American intervention.[4]

Some recent works have openly sought to move beyond the imperialism/security dichotomy. But the debate still permeates these works. Authors who implicitly or explicitly side with the exigencies of security as the foundation of U.S. policy toward the region have tended to focus on the activities of businessmen in Latin America. Holdovers for economic imperialism tend to focus now on capital flows as the vector for

---

[4] Samuel Flagg Bemis, The Latin American Policy of the United States (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1943). Edwin Lieuwen, U.S. Policy in Latin America: A Short History (New York: Praeger, 1965); Gil, Latin American-United States; Cole Blasier, Hovering Giant: U.S. Responses to Revolutionary Change in Latin America (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1976); and Lars Schoultz, National Security and United States Policy toward Latin America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987) blame U.S. economic imperialism. Dana Munro, Intervention and Dollar Diplomacy in the Caribbean (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964); Gordon Connell-Smith, The Inter-American System (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966); Manuel Espinoza, Inter-American Beginnings of U.S. Cultural Diplomacy (Washington: U.S. State Department, 1976); Abraham F. Lowenthal, Partners in Conflict: The United States and Latin America (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987); and Gaddis Smith, The Last Years of the Monroe Doctrine (New York: Hill & Wang, 1994), cite security, and not always uncritically. For the Good Neighbor Policy debate, see Lloyd C. Gardner, Economic Aspects of New Deal Diplomacy (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964); Green, Containment of Latin America; Irwin F. Gellman, Good Neighbor Diplomacy: United States Policies in Latin America, 1933-1945 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979); David F. Haglund, Latin America and the Transformation of U.S. Strategic Thought, 1936-1940 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984); Bryce Wood, The Making of the Good Neighbor Policy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961); and Alexander Deconde, Herbert Hoover's Latin American Policy (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951).

economic intervention. Mark Gilderhaus ruminates that U.S.-Latin American relations must be seen in their international context, as a historical process of "reciprocal interactions." Lester Langley chastises the persistent and wholly unrealistic idealism of Latin Americans in the face of the unwavering, but no less self-congratulatory and self-deceiving, "realism" of the United States. Langley and Gilderhaus do not ignore economic consideration or the asymmetrical power relationship that exists between the United States and the nations of the region; they just do not choose to privilege political and economic imperialism in their analysis. Peter Smith and Lars Schoulz, on the other hand, still do. But they are looking to find a more complete explanation for the hows and whys of American economic predominance. Smith blames the routine United States support of dictatorships on American efforts to expand its dominance of the world system. Lars Schoulz, an outspoken critic of U.S. policy for decades, bluntly doubts the United States can ever overcome the innate paternalism that he believes has dominated every aspect of its relations with Latin America for generations. Ft. Gulick plays a tangential role at best in these works. Langley and Gilderhaus do not rate the School of the Americas or counterinsurgency training a mention, but they do criticize the practice of U.S. policy that buttressed repression in the region. Smith and Schoulz, on the other hand, view Ft. Gulick as a coercive instrument, albeit a minor one, designed by the United States to prop up dictatorships. In turn, those authoritarian regimes kept their

markets and resources available predominantly for the United States. Security and economics still continue to direct the historiography.[5]

The stability versus economics debate definitely shapes the literature on the region most directly affected by U.S. military policy over time: Central America. Thomas Leonard provides some useful snippets of the Central American context as he traces the major events in U.S.-Central American diplomatic history within the framework of The Search for Stability. John Coatsworth offers a much more critical look at how the United States has used its overweening military and economic power to perpetuate the "client" status of the Central American nations in order to ensure security and the region's dependence on the U.S. economy. Both rate Kennedy's counterinsurgency training a brief mention but do not mention the School of the Americas as they concentrate on the political dynamics of U.S.-Central American relations. James Dunkerley, a long-time socialist critic of U.S. policy in El Salvador and Bolivia, wrote a series of books in the 1980s on the dizzying array of leftist movements that emerged in those countries. He characterized the violent political opposition to

[5] Paul Dosal, Doing Business with Dictators: A Political History of United Fruit in Guatemala, 1899-1944 (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1993); and Thomas F. O'Brien, The Century of U.S. Capitalism in Latin America (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999), are generally held up as examples of the new business history. See Paul W. Drake, The Money Doctor in the Andes: The Kemmerer Missions, 1923-1933 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1989); and Stallings, Banker to the World, on capital flows and investment in Latin America. Mark T. Gilderhaus, The Second Century: U.S.-Latin American Relations since 1889 (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2000); Lester Langley, The United States and Latin America in the Twentieth Century, 4th ed. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989); Peter H. Smith, Talons of the Eagle: Dynamics of U.S. Latin American Relations (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); and Lars Schultz, Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy toward Latin America (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998). See also idem, Human Rights and United States Policy toward Latin America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

oligarchies as the inevitable outcome of an exploited working class. Power in the Isthmus combines his thoughts of a decade and touches, at times, on how the United States has exploited the glaring power inequalities in Central America to preserve its economic dominance of the region. Walter LaFeber makes his case more explicitly. He contends that the United States has consciously sought to maintain economic predominance in Central America. To do so, American policymakers have allied with a continuous series of brutal dictatorships that have themselves persistently thwarted the aspirations of the region's peoples in their own quest to perpetuate generations-old inequalities. The result, LaFeber argues, is a pattern of government abuse that leads to revolt by the poorer segments of the population that repression – and U.S. support of the oppressors – cannot stop. Both Dunkerley and LaFeber blame U.S. military aid for helping to perpetuate the existing power and economic inequalities, but American counterinsurgency policy does not play a major role in their stories and the School of the Americas receives only a bare mention in the latter work. United States military policy also gets blamed for the growth of dictatorships throughout Central America in the late 1960s and early 1970s in Don Etchison's 1975 work. While Etchison does not give particular attention to the School of the Americas, he does note the differential experience of U.S. military policy on the nations of Latin America.[6]

---

[6] Thomas M. Leonard, Central America and the United States: The Search for Stability (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1991), 151; and Coatsworth, Central America and the United States, 105-6. See for example James Dunkerley, Unity and Struggle: Trade Unions in Latin America (London: Latin American Bureau, 1980); idem, Rebellion in the Veins: Political Struggle in Bolivia, 1952-1882 (London: Verso, 1984); idem, Political Transition and Economic Stabilization in Bolivia, 1982-89 (London: Institute for Latin American Studies, 1990); and idem, Power in the Isthmus: A Political History of Modern Central

Four Central American countries received acute attention by the U.S. Army during the cold war: Nicaragua, Panama, Guatemala, and El Salvador. The United States created the Nicaraguan National Guard during the U.S. marine occupation of the country between 1926-1933, and Anastasio Somoza used his position as its chief to take control of Nicaragua when the United States pulled out. While historians have well established the close ties between the United States military and the Somoza family that ruled Nicaragua from 1933-1979, none examines the role of the School of the Americas. While the U.S. armed services had three different military training facilities in the Panama Canal Zone during the cold war – Ft. Allbrook provided Latin American Air Force training, Ft. Amador hosted the Inter-American Police Academy, and Ft. Gulick housed the U.S. Army Caribbean School – studies of Panama focus on the battle with the United States over control of the canal. In her analysis of the U.S. invasion of Panama in 1989, Margaret Scranton only mentions the U.S. Army School of the Americas as the origin of the relationship between the United States and the ousted President Manuel Noriega. Guatemala has felt the significant impact of U.S. military training and aid. Caesar D. Sereseres tied U.S. Military Assistance Program Aid with growing military rule in Guatemala in the 1960s. Sheryl Shirley updated that account in her 1997 effort, which revealed that U.S. security policy had the unintended consequence of exacerbating divisions within the Guatemalan military. But she, too, argued that counterinsurgency

---

America (London: Verso, 1988). Walter LaFeber, Inevitable Revolutions, 2d rev. ed. (New York: Norton, 1993); and Don L. Etchison, The United States and Militarism in Central America (New York: Praeger, 1975).

and intelligence training enabled the Guatemalan military to more effectively suppress dissent. U.S. policy in Guatemala in the 1980s has also come under fire. Miller and Seeman provided details of the range of U.S. security aid, while Michael McClintock blasted the consequences of U.S. Army and Drug Enforcement Administration aid. McClintock explicitly connects American aid to patterns of increased repression by the Guatemalan military, which in turn served as the catalyst for a vicious civil war overshadowed by the Reagan administration's obsession with El Salvador. The civil war in El Salvador spawned a veritable host of works attacking the Reagan administration's anti-Communist policy and military assistance to the Salvadoran Army in the 1980s. William LeoGrande provides perhaps the best account of the formation of U.S. policy and its intersection in Central America. The role of the School of the Americas, however, never receives more than tangential mention in these works. They reference only the Kennedy administration and the assumption of counterinsurgency policy.[7]

---

[7] Macaulay, Sandino Affair remains the best single volume on the U.S. occupation, while Boot, Savage Wars of Peace, places U.S. intervention in historical perspective. Knut Walter, The Regime of Anastasio Somoza, 1936-1956 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993) explores the political gamesmanship of the founding Somoza and his ability to play off contending forces inside his country; Paul Coe Clark, Jr, The United States and Somoza, 1933-1956: A Revisionist Look (New York: Praeger, 1992), reveals Somoza's political acumen in reading the ebb and flow of U.S. policy to his best advantage; and Booth, End and the Beginning, offers a thorough accounting of the proximate causes of the 1979 overthrow of the Somoza dynasty. David McCullogh, The Path Between the Seas (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1977), remains the most comprehensive study of the building of the Canal. See Michael L. Conniff, Panama and the United States: The Forced Alliance (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992); Walter LaFeber, The Panama Canal: The Crisis in Historical Perspective, updated ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989). And see the bibliographical essays in Conniff, Panama and the United States, 193-6; and LaFeber, Panama Canal, 249-57. Margaret Scranton, The Noriega Years (Boulder: Westview, 1991), takes Panama up to the 1989 U.S. invasion; Caesar D. Sereseres, "Military Development and the United States Military Assistance Program for Latin America: The Case of Guatemala, 1961-1969," 263 leaves, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Riverside, 1971 (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1972,), OCLC: 13906998, Microfilm; Sheryl Lynn Shirley, "The Impact of United States Security Assistance on Democracy in Latin America: The Case of Guatemala during the 1960s," Ph.D. Dissertation,

The School of the Americas does not figure into the literature on Cuba even though the Cuban Revolution plays a catalytic role in U.S.-Latin American relations. Cuban historiography is dominated by two dates: 1895 and 1959. In 1895, José Martí launched what would become the final stage of a decades-long independence process. That date is generally seen as but the precursor to the true liberation of the island with Fidel Castro's 1959 overthrow of the dictator Fulgencio Batista. Gerald Poyo, Ada Ferrer and Aline Helg, however, demonstrate the necessity of viewing the independence process as part of a long emancipation movement. The white landed elites who sided with independence and the United States against Spain used their access to the United States military to stifle the black majority in the years after the Spanish-American War. José Martinez-Hernandez traces how the United States military built Cuba's fitful armed forces under the Platt Protectorate. In 1933, not unlike Anastasio Somoza, Batista used his country's armed forces to place himself in power in 1933. Unlike Somoza, however, Batista had been a sergeant. Most of the literature on U.S.-Cuban relations focuses on the

---

University of Texas, 1997, AAT 9803024 http://80-wwwlib.umi.com.content.lib.utexas.edu:2048/cr/utexas/fullcit?p9803024; Michael McClintock, The American Connection (London: Zed, 1985); and Delia Miller and Roland Seeman, with Cynthia Arnson, Background Information on Guatemala, the Armed Forces and U.S. Military Assistance (Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1981), examine the evolution of U.S. counterinsurgency training and its attendant effects in Guatemala. Gettleman, et al., eds., El Salvador, have compiled a thorough survey of published documents that frames U.S. policy toward the violence in El Salvador up to 1981. For a look at the socio-economic roots of resistance in El Salvador, see Liisa North, Bitter Grounds: Roots of Revolt in El Salvador 2d ed. (Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill, 1989); Dunkerly, Long War, provides a sympathetic and detailed look at the politics of the rebellion, while Michael T. Klare and Cynthia Arnson, Supplying Repression: U.S. Support of Authoritarian Regimes Abroad, foreword Richard Falk (Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1981), place El Salvador within the context of the Military Assistance Program. See also Brian Loveman, For La Patria: Politics and the Armed Forces in Latin America (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1999), 192-202, for discussion of military rule. And William LeoGrande, "Our Own Backyard": The United States in Central America, 1977-1992 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).

Cuban Revolution, the Bay of Pigs fiasco, and the Cuban Missile Crisis in October of 1962. United States opposition to Cuba generally gets explained, once again, as either the product of American anti-Communism or advancing hegemony. Peréz and Benjamin fall into the latter category with rather celebratory and deterministic efforts. Stephen Rabe argues that President Eisenhower prefigured the Alliance for Progress by calling for concerted American economic aid to Latin America to offset the social strains produced by dire poverty in the region. Thomas Paterson traces the evolution of the American response to Castro going back to 1956, and Robert Quirk shows the popularity of the figure of Fidel within and outside of Cuba. Like Rabe, these two authors focus on American anti-Communism and national security threats to explain U.S. policy. Morris Morely, on the other hand, offers a sophisticated yet ultimately reductionist account when he characterizes the United States' antagonistic relationship to Cuba following the revolution as but the inevitable actions of an "imperial State," one which serves the needs of the American ruling class by using the state apparatus to secure political and economic hegemony in this most vital island.[8]

---

[8] On the events and themes leading up to 1895, see Rosalie Schwartz, Lawless Liberators: Political Banditry and Cuban Independence (Durham: Duke University Press, 1989); Philip S. Foner, Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of American Imperialism, 1895-1898, vol. 1 (New York: Monthly Review, 1972); Robert L. Paquette, Sugar Is Made of Blood: The Conspiracy of La Escalera and the Conflict between Empires over Slavery in Cuba (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1988); Rebecca J. Scott, Slave Emancipation in Cuba: The Transition to Free Labor, 1860-1899 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); and Louis A. Pérez, Jr., Lords of the Mountain: Social Banditry and Peasant Protest in Cuba, 1878-1918 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989). Pérez first used Hobsbawm's thesis in Louis A. Pérez, Jr., "Vagrants, Beggars, and Bandits: Social Origins of Cuban Separatism, 1878-1895," American Historical Review vol. 90 no. 5 (Dec. 1985), 1092-1121. See E. J. Hobsbawm, Primitive Rebels (New York: Norton, 1965), [1959]; and idem, Bandits (New York: Dell, 1971), [1969], for explication of the model of social conditions that produce "social bandits." And see Benjamin, United States and the Origins of the Cuban Revolution; and Louis A. Pérez, Jr., Cuba: Between Reform and Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), for the triumphal view of 1959.

The Cuban Revolution also had a profound impact on the armed forces of the rest of Latin America. In the early 1960s, two authors in particular set the range of debate over the enduring power of the region's military in domestic politics with rather different views. Edwin Lieuwen attacked the U.S. policy of the decade for reinforcing the power of the region's military, institutions that have a long history of political intervention throughout Latin America. He criticized the United States for overreacting to the Cuban Revolution and warned that counterinsurgency training would only seat the entrenched military even deeper into their nation's politics. John Johnson also traces the history of the Latin American military as an institution. Johnson draws on the case of Brazil prior to 1964 to argue that the military institutions of the region represent an untapped and potentially powerful force for democratization. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, another wave of authoritarian regimes had swept through Latin America, leading a number of authors to examine how the military and economic elites negotiated position and power after military coups occurred in country after country. Political scientists in particular sought to explain how the authoritarian state in Latin America was forced to

---

Gerald E. Poyo, "With All and for the Good of All": The Emergence of Popular Nationalism in the Cuban Communities of the United States, 1848-1898 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1989); Ada Ferrer, "Social Aspects of Cuban Nationalism: Race, Slavery, and the Guerra Chiquita, 1879-1880," Cuban Studies vol. 21 (1990), 37-56; and Helg, Our Rightful Share; Hernández, Cuba and the United States; Stephen G. Rabe, Eisenhower and the Cold War: The Foreign Policy of Anti-Communism (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press); Paterson, Contesting Castro; Quirk, Fidel Castro; and Morley, Imperial State and Revolution.

accommodate military participation in every aspect of governance, including mundane matters that military regimes prior to the 1960s had disdained.[9]

Most students of Latin American politics blamed counterinsurgency training for the persistence of military rule in Latin America in the 1980s and even the 1990s. Brian Loveman brings together nearly four decades of literature to trace the Latin American armed forces' evolving sense of mission during the twentieth century. Like Nunn, Lieuwen, and many others, and including the work he and Thomas Davies began two decades earlier, Loveman details how U.S. counterinsurgency training did stimulate the region's militaries in the 1960s to a new conviction of preeminence in shaping the economic and political future of their underdeveloped states. To be sure, the Latin American military drew on their own deeply rooted sense of importance and the conviction that they alone could defend their fatherland from the threat of Communist subversion. But the United States planted and nurtured that conviction with military aid and counterinsurgency training that enabled authoritarian governments to maintain internal security for nearly three decades after the Cuban Revolution. United States policy in the 1970s and 1980s had the unintended consequence of laying the groundwork

---

[9] Edwin Lieuwen, Arms and Politics in Latin America, rev. ed. (New York: Praeger, 1961); and John J. Johnson, The Military and Society in Latin America (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964). For authoritarianism and Latin American politics, see Edward Feit, The Armed Bureaucrats: Military Administration Regimes and Political Development (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973); David Collier, The New Authoritarianism in Latin America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, eds., Transition from Authoritarian Rule: Latin America (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986); Francía Elena Díaz Cardona, Fuerzas armadas, militarismo y constitución nacional en América latina (Mexico: UNAM, 1988); and Alfred Stepan, Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).

for the end of this latest round of military rule in Latin America. Karen Remmer and Patricio Silva show how Latin American military tried to employ the economic models of Milton Friedman and the "Chicago School." The United States insisted as a part of continuing development programs that Latin American nations adopt market reforms directed by U.S. government officials. More than anything else, Remmer argues, the failure of the economic programs of every single military regime led to a fitful democratization process that began in the late 1980s in Latin America. Erik Hjonnerod notes that many of the region's military, still smarting from their economic fiascos, were reluctant to participate in the latest United States crusade against narcotraficantes. Colombia has been one of the few countries to embrace the new policy, but they still need counterinsurgency aid. Of course, as Paul Gootenberg and Gary Webb detail, more than a few military men of all ranks took advantage of their countries' growth industry. Collectively, these works demonstrate the dramatic and disproportionate impact of U.S. military training, of which the School of the Americas was a relatively small part, on the Latin American military and the military's decision to personally direct their nations' politics again and again in the three decades after the Cuban Revolution.[10]

---

[10] Brian Loveman and Thomas M. Davies, Jr., eds., The Politics of Antipolitics: The Military in Latin America, 2d rev. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 308-14; Loveman, La Patria, 160-192, especially 189-191; Frederick Nunn, The Time of the Generals: Latin American Professional Militarism in World Perspective (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992); Edward Lieuwen, Generals vs. Presidents: Neo-Militarism in Latin America (New York: Praeger, 1964); and Lieuwen, Arms and Politics, 122-53, 229-44. See also Begnt Abrahamsson, Military Professionalization and Political Power (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972); Victor Alba, El militarismo (Mexico: UNAM, 1960); Jan Knippers Black, Sentinels of Empire: The United States and Latin American Militarism (Westport: Greenwood, 1986); and Roderick Camp, Generals in the Palacio: The Military in Modern Mexico (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992). For the failure of monetarist market reforms, see Karen Remmer, The Chilean Military under Authoritarian Rule (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987); idem, Military Rule in Latin

The literature on U.S. military policy toward the region concentrates on how the United States overtly subordinated the position of the Latin American military. Unlike the literature on the Latin American military, U.S. military policy studies still debate the potential democratizing power of the Latin American armed forces. United States military aid helped standardize hemispheric defense and facilitated economic development according to J. Lloyd Mecham. Raymond Estep draws from his access to Military Assistance Program data to expose the decidedly limited responsibilities given to Latin America in hemispheric security and their absence in the decision-making process. Samuel Huntington lent analytical weight that proved crucial to the framing of U.S. military policy in the 1960s and 1970s. Better known for his role in shaping U.S. policy in Vietnam, Huntington developed a model in 1964 for promoting civil-military relations. He posited that the United States could create the requisite "subjective" factors in the military institutions of underdeveloped nations, and that U.S. military training could socialize the officers themselves to accept civilian and constitutional authority. At the same time, Huntington argued that the United States' military assistance and training had

---

America (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1988); and Patricio Silva, "Technocrats and Politics in Chile: From the Chicago Boys to the CIEPLAN Monks," Journal of Latin American Studies vol. 23 no. 2 (May 1991), 385-410. The literature on drug trafficking is rather replete with simplistic policy paeans, but usefully includes J. Erik Kjonnerod, ed., Evolving U.S. Strategy for Latin America and the Caribbean (Washington: National Defense University Press, 1992); Teodoro F. Etienne, Fuerzas armadas de América latina: nuevo rol: problemática de la droga (Bogotá: Tercer Mundo, 1997); María Verónica Bastias, El salario del miedo: narcotráfico en América latina (Buenos Aires: SERPAJ-AL, 1993); and William O. Walker III, ed., Drugs in the Western Hemisphere: An Odyssey of Cultures in Conflict (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1996). On cocaine, political corruption, and the United States, see Edmundo Morales, Cocaine: White Gold Rush in Peru (Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 1989); Paul Gootenberg, ed., Cocaine: Global Histories (London: Routledge, 1999); and Gary Webb, Dark Alliance: The CIA, the Contras, and the Crack Cocaine Explosion (New York: Seven Stories, 1999). [1998].

to preserve the "objective" factors, to allow military institutions to keep professional autonomy. Huntington believed the Military Assistance Program could promote both "subjective" and "objective" factors and develop modern, civil-military hierarchies that would embrace the rule of law as the foundation of their democratizing societies. John Child analyzes the Inter-American system up to the eve of the Nicaraguan Revolution and argues that only twice since 1938 did U.S. and Latin American perceptions of security coincide: during World War II and in the few years after the Cuban Revolution. Child contends that the United States deliberately kept the alliance "unequal," subordinated Latin American security concerns, and consequently did not reap a fraction of the potential benefits of the alliance. Max Boot seeks to remind readers of the lesson learned by U.S. Marines who fought in a series of "small wars" in the Caribbean, Central America, and Asia in the early twentieth century. He argues that the marines encapsulated their experience in the "small wars" field manual that emphasized the necessity of securing the full-faith effort of the host country to actively address the legitimate aspirations of their populations. Otherwise, the marines wrote, any U.S. effort was a waste of time and would only lead the people of that country to identify the United States as their oppressors.[11]

---

[11] J. Lloyd Mecham, The United States and Inter-American Security (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961); Raymond Estep, U.S. Military Aid to Latin America (Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University, 1966); Samuel P. Huntington, The Soldier and State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations (New York: Vantage, 1964); John Child, Unequal Alliance: The Inter-American Military System, 1938-1978 (Boulder: Westview, 1980); and Boot, Savage Wars of Peace.

The School of the Americas, unfortunately, has received only tangential treatment in the diplomatic and military history literature. Those historians who have addressed the School of the Americas in their works generally conclude that it did indeed promote a new emphasis on counterinsurgency training. In the mid-1960s, Barber and Ronning argued that a shift occurred at the School after 1960 from training for hemispheric defense to an emphasis on counterinsurgency. Like McClintock later, they correctly noted that the School of the Americas represented one of many training programs across the globe that took on added importance with the perceived rise in Communist subversion in the 1960s. Each, however, offered only limited discussion of the School itself. Loveman and Davies argue that Ché Guevara, as the preeminent architect of Cuban foreign policy in the 1960s, in effect "declared war" against the United States, its interests and its allies with the publication of his insurgent's manual, Guerrilla Warfare. They, along with McClintock, Leacock, and LaFeber, contend that U.S. counterinsurgency programs and training represented a direct response to the challenge posed by the Cuban Revolution to American economic and political hegemony in the hemisphere, and that they must be viewed in this light. These authors argue that Walt W. Rostow provided the intellectual underpinnings for counterinsurgency policy for American policymakers, especially in the Kennedy administration, when he argued that specialized training could enable the military of the region to provide political stability. Such stability was essential for underdeveloped Latin American nations to develop the economic and political preconditions necessary for democratic institutions to take hold. Still, despite their apparent importance to the development of counterinsurgency policy,

no systematic evaluation of the policy, mission, and techniques utilized at the school, or its relationship to the formation of U.S.-Latin American policy, yet exists for this formative period. Critics of the U.S. Army School of the Americas's role in training the Salvadoran Army in the early 1980s have produced a couple of polemics and video that dubbed the facility at Ft. Gulick and later at Ft. Benning the "School of Assassins." Mark Danner used the United Nations Truth Commission's findings as a foil to examine the role of the United States in the cover up of human rights abuses, and not the school per se. In response, a long-time instructor at the School of Americas, Lt. Col. Russell Ramsay (Ret.), follows in the Huntington tradition and argues that the school still offers a unique opportunity to inculcate Latin American military in proper civil-military relations.[12]

Historians' emphasis on economic and security concerns has left out critical examination of cultural presuppositions, biases, and even racism as determinants of U.S.-

---

[12] The few works that mention the U.S. Army School of the Americas include, Willard Barber and C. Neale Ronning, Internal Security and Military Power: Counterinsurgency and Civic Action in Latin America (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1966), 144-8; Michael McClintock, Strategies of Statecraft: U.S. Guerrilla Warfare, Counter-Insurgency, and Counterterrorism, 1940-1990 (New York: Pantheon, 1992), 185; Guevara, Guerrilla Warfare, eds. Loveman and Davies, ix; idem, Politics of Antipolitics, 163-5; McClintock, Strategies of Statecraft, 161-78; Ruth Leacock, Requiem for Revolution: The United States and Brazil, 1961-1969 (London: Kent State University Press, 1990), 61-5; LaFeber, Inevitable Revolutions 195-6. Max F. Millikin and Walt W. Rostow, A Proposal: Key to an Effective Foreign Policy (New York: Harper, 1957); and Walt W. Rostow, "Guerrilla Warfare in Underdeveloped Areas," Marine Corps Gazette vol. 46 no. 1 (Jan. 1962), 46-49 encapsulate the development/ counterinsurgency ideology of the Kennedy administration. Challengers of the School of the Americas and its participation in human rights abuses can be found in Mark Danner, The Massacre at El Mozote (New York: Vintage, 1994). [1993]; "School of Americas, School of Assassins," (New York: Maryknoll World Productions, 1994), 20 min., video; Vicky Imerman, SOA Alumni and Human Rights Abuse (Gilbert, IA: Info SOA, [1995]); Info SOA, La lagartija=Little lizard: Newsletter of Info SOA (Gilbert, IA: Info SOA, 1995); Jack Nelson-Palmeyer, School of Assassins (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997), 18-36; and Russell W. Ramsey, ed., Guardians of the Other Americas: Essays on the Military Forces of Latin America (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1997).

Latin American policy in the literature. Some authors have postulated the effect of cultural bias on U.S.-Latin American policy. Michael Krenn, a long-time critic of the U.S. State Department and its dealings with Africa and African Americans, has edited with Paul Finkleman a series of collected works that traces the impact of race on U.S. foreign policy since the revolutionary period. Racist conceptions of white supremacy drove Indian removal policies and western expansion, according to Reginald Horsman, and Anders Stephenson contends that the soaring boosterism of the 1840s laid the foundation of moral superiority in United States foreign policy that has persisted ever since. For Rubin Weston, racist expansionists propelled American imperialism in the last decade of the nineteenth century. It is not too difficult to conceive of race as a significant determinant in U.S. foreign policy in the 1800s. But others have made the case that the legacy of America's paternalistic past permeated the next century as well. Frederick Pike offers a more culturally nuanced work as he argues that American notions of "civilization" reduced the peoples of Latin America – along with all other non-white and non-Protestant groups, women, and even children – to primitive victims of nature and traditional ways that begged for domination. John Johnson offers an enlightening look at the depictions of Latin Americans in the news media of the United States, which highlight the stereotypes perpetuated in American culture. Schmitz, like Lars Schoulz, contends that the United States willingly accepted virulent anti-Communist dictatorships during the cold war because American policymakers believed that non-white peoples of the world were simply not ready for self government. Michael Hunt offers some rather colorful anecdotes that highlight the paternalism of the Eisenhower administration and

the power of ideology to direct American foreign policy over time, and not just during the cold war. Richard Drinnon explains the twentieth-century American collision with Asia – in the Philippines, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam – as the logical outgrowth of racist attitudes shaped during the previous three centuries of continental conquest of North America. The east-west orientation of United States foreign policy during the cold war, Drinnon argues, does nothing to belie the lasting power of 350 years of conflict with the "savage and barbarous" red, yellow, brown, and black peoples of the world. Combined, these authors make a compelling case for including racial and cultural bias as a factor that shaped American foreign policy, especially towards a region like Latin America.[13]

**THE HEGEMONIC PROJECT**

The United States government has played a role in securing markets overseas for the sake of American businessmen and the American economy. Few students of U.S.-Latin American relations would argue this point. But it is questionable to what extent policy has represented the conscious advance of American economic hegemony, and in

---

[13] For an introduction to the significance of race and U.S. policy toward Latin America, start with Alexander DeConde, Ethnicity, Race, and American Foreign Policy: A History (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992); and Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. Legrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore, eds., Close Encounters with Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations (Durham: Duke University Pres, 1998). See for example Michael L. Krenn and Paul Finkleman, eds., Race and U.S. Foreign Policy: From Colonial Times to the Age of Jackson (New York: Taylor & Francis, 1998). And Reginald Horsman, Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981); Anders Stephenson, Manifest Destiny: American Expansionism and the Empire of Right (New York: Hill & Wang, 1995); Rubin Francis Weston, Racism in U.S. Imperialism: The Influence of Racial Assumptions on American Foreign Policy, 1893-1946 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1972); Frederick B. Pike, The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992); John J. Johnson, Latin America in Caricature (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980); Michael H. Hunt, Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987); and Richard Drinnon, Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian Hating and Empire Building (New York: Shoken, 1990). [1980].

the case of this discussion counterinsurgency training has in turn merely reflected the arm of the state working to stifle dissent. To begin with, the nature of the representative democracy that exists in the United States does not permit such an entity as the reified state to exist. Consequently, while economic elites do possess vastly disproportionate economic power, those same elites have over the past two centuries had to accept preferential treatment by the federal government rather than direction and control governance at the national level. Different groups, ethnic, racial, and religious minorities, along with women, have battled successfully for greater and greater inclusion in the decision-making process in the United States. While those groups do not yet enjoy equal participation, the federal and state government does have to address the collective desires of interest groups other than economic elites. Because of their wealth and greater access to the government, economic elites can and do seek to circumscribe the range of debate and action. Hence, there is something to the argument that U.S. policy advances the interests of industrial capitalism in the United States. But it is the production of ideas that holds the key to understanding the purpose of economic development and counterinsurgency training as a part of U.S. policy toward Latin America. And Antonio Gramsci offers a tool to ascertain how those ideas are constructed – the hegemonic project.

Antonio Gramsci is a historical materialist. Marxists operate from the presumption that class divides modern industrial societies, with class position determined by the objective relations to the means of production. Asymmetrical power relations are inherent to class structures. Dominant classes possess power and do their best to

perpetuate that power. Subordinate classes struggle against domination from a position of weakness. Gamsci refines this model in his collected maunderings, The Prison Notebooks, by focusing on the production of ideas. First, he divides society into two classes: ruling and subaltern. Dominant classes, from which the ruling class arises, by definition engage subalterns in a struggle to control the surplus value of labor. Gramsci argues, however, that economic interests alone cannot unite the competing factions that exist within the dominant classes of capitalist societies. Instead, he believes that there exists a connection between objective reality and the ideas that shape one's perceptions of his or her experience. Consequently, factions within the dominant class work to produce an "ideological consensus," a world view shared by society that provides legitimacy to ruling-class authority and perpetuates their power. The "intellectual" elite of society are chosen to craft the ideas – the hegemonic project – that will reinforce ruling class authority. The state disseminates the hegemonic project in order to lend it political legitimacy. Now, the ruling class has defined the very ideas of political participation in order to circumscribe the range of political debate. The state has the responsibility of maintaining social order. In "moments of crisis," or subaltern social, political, or economic activism, the state is expected to enforce "discipline on those groups who do not 'consent' either actively or passively" to the hegemonic project of the ruling class. When the existing hegemonic project is sufficiently threatened by collective subaltern action, then a new ruling class will emerge with a new hegemonic project to restore dominance. Even though Gramsci grants some reactive role to the subaltern in his model,

people are generally not historical actors but instead are subject to the weight of historical process and the ideological consensus of ruling class hegemony.[14]

The strength of Gramscian notions of hegemony lies in the emphasis on the social production of ideas and, in turn, policy. There are, however, a few important caveats. Derek Sayer challenges historians to demonstrate, first of all, that any such hegemonic program consciously exists in the minds of elites. William Roseberry sees hegemony as a complex, dynamic process shaped by contestation in the material and political reality of social relations. Further, he argues that this contested social terrain is a discursive one in which the meanings of the very words themselves evolve, not via any hegemonic imposition of elite ideology, but amidst a dynamic process of social interaction between subalterns and dominant classes. T. Jackson Lears concurs, arguing that language can serve as the medium to create historical blocs that cut across class lines and that may, in time, supplant an existing hegemony. Lears applauds the discovery of this concept by American historians, because he believes hegemony can illuminate the oft-ignored nature of power in the United States. But since hegemony is wedded to language, and language is a cultural phenomenon, hegemony must be seen as cultural. To view it as such, however, requires an appreciation of all the cultural components – race, class, gender,

[14] Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci, ed. and trans. Quinten Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International, 1971), 12.

and ethnicity – that empower hegemony's persistence. Lears believes that hegemony manifests itself in the United States through advertising.[15]

More often, economic elites exercise their influence through the ideas of business organization. And for Gramsci, the most important hegemonic project of the twentieth century was contained in Fordism. Fordism is not just a propagation of ideas. Rather, its utility stems from its ability to engage workers in a work regime that reinforces the ideas of a specific social order. Moreover, this demanding work regime purges workers of the energy necessary to mount a counter-hegemonic project, and therefore prevents workers from indulging in what the ruling class views as socially unacceptable behavior. Gramsci also believes that all people are philosophers who consider their world but are forced to deal with their material reality, which does not permit, or often jibe with, their ideas. Fordism, Gramsci contends, offers a totalizing hegemonic project for the ruling class because it resolves the workers' paradox by creating and propagating notions of the worker as a critical cog in a social project of national development. Fordism makes ideas fit reality, at least the reality the ruling class would like to see.[16]

Fordism emerged out of the scientific management movement of the early twentieth century. The late nineteenth century in America witnessed the rapid and often

---

[15] Derek Sayer, "Everyday Forms of State Formation: Some Dissident Remarks on 'Hegemony'," in Everyday Forms of State Formation, eds. Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), 367-77; William Roseberry, "Hegemony and the Language of Contention," in Everyday Forms of State Formation, 355-66; T. Jackson Lears, "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities," American Historical Review vol. 90 no. 3 (June 1985), 567-93; and see idem, Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising (New York: Basic Books, 1994).

[16] See Gramsci, Prison Notebooks, 277-320.

chaotic reorganization of all facets of life. Amidst the rapidly advancing technology, American businesses sought a means to improve efficiency and replace labor as an independent variable with experts who could determine the nature of production. Frederick Winslow Taylor offered scientific management as a palliative for wasteful, inefficient industrial production. Taylor argued that his methods would provide the optimal environment for harmonious, efficient production, themes that Progressive America found quite appealing. Taylor's program called for the elimination of decentralized production under the foreman, or "gang leader." He contended that managers must remove from workers the responsibility of decision making in the production process, and instead provide them with the tools and environment necessary to work most efficiently. To do so, a manager must determine what constitutes a "proper day's work." In Shop Management, Taylor details his method of time studies, using a stopwatch, a log book, and mathematical calculations, to ascertain the nature and, most important, the rate of work over time during a given work day. So armed, managers could then develop a "differential rate of piece work," alternately rewarding and punishing workers with pay based, not per unit, but on the rate of work during a work day. In order to gain optimum output, a manager "must give some special incentive," through advancement, monetary bonuses, and training, to his "workman." Only then could management train workers in scientifically designed work regimes that provided

for the "maximum prosperity for the employer . . . coupled with the maximum prosperity for the employé."[17]

Business in the United States selected only portions of Taylor's methods. Milton J. Nadworny cites United States government documents to show that "scientific management" came to represent something quite different from the specific protocols of Frederick Winslow Taylor. Barbara Weinstein declares that the "blatantly oppressive features of Taylorism" explain its minimal adoption in the United States. Hindy Lauer Schachter, on the other hand, seeks to resurrect Taylor, arguing that this "authoritarian" and "primitive" reputation belies a democratic spirit. Petersen, et al., contend that critics of Taylor are in fact challenging the overweening enthusiasm of Taylor's proponents, who "conducted an avid search for the 'one best way'." Sudhir Kakar, in his psychohistory of an "innovative personality," insists that Taylor consistently emphasized the "economic man" and that a "worker's only motivation . . . was an extra bonus." Wrege and Greenwood counter that Taylor's "dynamic" system has "never been installed." Schachter also argues that Taylor's efforts to systematize production reflected industrialists' desire in the United States during the late nineteenth century for greater efficiency. The literature on management in the United States reflects this rationalization of the workplace. Guillén writes that business pushed for greater efficiency, used the stopwatch, but ignored the admonitions regarding worker compensation. The rise of

---

[17] Frederick Winslow Taylor, The Principles of Scientific Management (New York: Norton, 1967), 53. [1911]. See Frederick Winslow Taylor, Shop Management (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1911), 149-168, for the author's discussion of time studies; and ibid., 76; Taylor, Scientific Management, 33; and ibid., 9.

scientific management warrants only a brief mention within the development of the "modern business enterprise" for Alfred DuPont Chandler, a proponent of the "structural analysis" school of American business management that emerged in the late 1950s in the United States. While Taylor became the "best known expert on factory management," for Chandler he represented a current in business thought that became known as the "line and staff type of factory organization." In The Visible Hand, Chandler describes an historical process of increasing business compartmentalization, professionalization, and management control of production that led to the modern business enterprise.[18]

The international consumption of scientific management proved to be variable and inconsistent as well. Kakar correctly noted that, "Taylor's ideas have had an enormous influence on the industrial life of all countries." He cites such historical luminaries as Georges Clemenceau and V. I. Lenin as devotees of the "universality and neutrality" of Taylor's system of industrial production. While Schachter notes that Robert Dahl and others "vilified" what they believed to be a persistent authoritarian strain in Taylor's ideas, scientific management and Taylorism spread far beyond the borders of the

---

[18] Milton J. Nadworny, Scientific Management and the Unions, 1900-1932: A Historical Analysis (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), 91; Barbara Weinstein, For Social Peace in Brazil: Industrialists and the Remaking of the Working Class in São Paulo, 1920-1964 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 5; Hindy Lauer Schachter, Frederick Taylor and the Public Administration Community: A Reevaluation (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989) 1; Elmore Petersen, et al., Business Organization and Management, 5th ed. (Homewood, IL: Richard D. Erwin, 1962), 253-4; Sudhir Kakar, Frederick Taylor: A Study in Personality (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1970), 99 and 193; Charles D. Wrege and Ronald F. Greenwood, Frederick W. Taylor, The Father of Scientific Management: Myth and Reality (Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin, 1991), 10; and Mauro F. Guillén, Models of Management: Work, Authority, and Organization in a Comparative Perspective (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 30-50; Alfred D. Chandler, The Visible Hand: The Management Revolution in American Business (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1977), 1 and 277.

United States. Europe in the 1920s found much appeal in scientific management and Fordism and "other equivalent nostrums," believing they were the "motor of American prosperity and social harmony." Maier argues that the political right in Italy, France and Germany "seized upon scientific management as a political weapon" in its effort to systematize "social control." In Germany, Mauro F. Guillén writes that the state played an active role in promoting a "mixed public-private orchestrated and corporatist organization of the economy." Mary Nolan traces the concerted efforts of "industrialists, bourgeois feminists, and social democratic trade leaders" in Weimar Germany to rationalize the working-class home and housework along the lines of Taylorism and scientific management. Spain adopted scientific management in the mid-1940s in response to the demands of World War II, more than two decades after the United States, which had done so in response to internal technological advancement and labor unrest. Don Van Atta argues that the failure of scientific management and Taylorism to take hold in the Soviet Union, despite its quite conscious adoption in the 1920s and 1930s, reflected a "quite different context" in which coercion replaced incentive in increasingly compartmentalized production regimes.[19]

Elites in Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Chile also adopted scientific management methods in an effort to enhance productivity. Barbara Weinstein details the efforts of

---

[19] Kakar, Frederick Taylor, 2-3; Schachter, Public Administration Community, 111; Charles S. Maier, Recasting Bourgeois Europe: Stabilization in France, Germany and Italy in the Decade After World War I (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 583; Guillén, Models of Management, 269; Mary Nolan, "Housework Made Easy: The Taylorized Housewife in Weimar Germany's Rationalized Economy," Feminist Studies vol. 16 no. 3 (Fall 1990), 549; and Don Van Atta, "Why Is There No Taylorism in the Soviet Union?" Comparative Politics vol. 18 no. 3 (Apr. 1986), 327.

Brazilian industrialists in the 1930s to adopt Fordism. Although he vehemently denied it, Henry Ford adopted many of Taylor's techniques and ideas regarding the scientific determination of the most efficient manner of production utilizing the least amount of time by the worker. Ford was a firm believer in the modernizing and beneficent effects of technology. He outlined his thoughts on business and labor relations in a widely read treatise entitled Today and Tomorrow, where Ford stressed the importance of saving natural resources, the value of wage incentives, and the necessity of standards. In his study of Ford's Highland Park, Michigan plant, Stephen Meyer writes that Ford management and production regimes created a legion of "deskilled specialists." Weinstein argues that Brazilian industrialists patterned their own "social hygiene" programs after Ford's Department of Sociology as part of a conscious effort to impose a new hegemonic project on the poor (and mostly black) women who worked in their factories. Guillén writes that Argentina's corporatist state could not overcome labor's opposition to scientific management. Robert Alexander concurs. Mirta Zaída Lobato describes how international competition had forced meatpackers in Argentina to increase the "parcelization of tasks" but that worker resistance prevented its adoption. In a consciously post-Structuralist effort, Daniel James argues that the Argentine working class opposed Taylorism and actively constructed alternative meanings to industrial life and developed political programs. Peter Winn describes the United States' aid programs in 1962 to Chile, which provided technical experts to help implement scientific management. This assistance "doubled" productivity but also "halved" the labor force.

Latin Americans wanted increased productivity and preferred U.S. production models, but local conditions predicated their consumption of Taylorism and Fordism.[20]

Taylorism and Fordism never did reach the status of a hegemonic project in the United States. Instead, the ideas of Frederick Winslow Taylor reflected a growing movement to organize and compartmentalize production in American industry at the turn of the twentieth century. Scientific management emerged as the preferred philosophy of the day, and Taylor's ideas lay at its core. While industrialists in the United States did not apply Taylorism in its totality, they embraced the central tenet that experts could identify rational production regimes to free American industry from the cultural baggage of nineteenth-century practices. Taylor's ideas did change work in the United States. And the widespread international adoption of Taylorism demonstrates the power of his ideas. German and Brazilian elites in the 1920s did attempt to employ Taylorism as a hegemonic project in their nations' modernization efforts. But the United States did not. Williams, McCormick, LaFeber, and other revisionists have long argued that, beginning at least in the late nineteenth century, the United States government accepted its

---

[20] Stephen H. Haber, Industry and Underdevelopment: The Industrialization of Mexico, 1890-1940 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989), examines the adoption of U.S. management practices in Mexico. Weinstein, Social Peace; Henry Ford, with Fay Leone Faurote, My Philosophy of Industry (New York: Coward-McCann, 1929); Henry Ford, with Samuel Crowther, Today and Tomorrow (New York: Doubleday, Page, & Co., 1926); Stephen Meyer, III, The Five Dollar Day: Labor Management and Social Control in the Ford Motor Company, 1908-1921 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1981), 19; Guillén, Models of Management, 271; Robert C. Alexander, Labor Relations in Argentina, Brazil and Chile, foreword John Dunlop (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962); Mirta Zaída Lobato, El "taylorismo" en la gran industria exportadora Argentina, 1907-1945 (Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América latina, 1988), 21; Daniel James, Resistance and Integration: Peronism and the Argentine Working Class, 1946-1976 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); and Peter Winn, "A Worker's Nightmare: Taylorism and the 1962 Yarur Strike in Chile," Radical History Review 58 (Win. 1994), 23.

responsibility as an emerging industrial state to procure for American business the markets necessary for capitalist expansion. While critics have rightly challenged the at times overweening emphasis on economic imperialism in revisionist works, the history of the United States for more than a century has witnessed a progressive trend toward greater and greater intervention by the federal government as a result of the acceptance of its responsibility to secure the nation's economy. Certain progressives, socialists, and union activists may have wanted government to intercede more often in the first decades of the century, but Americans in the main, and business and industry in particular, did not see the need prior to 1929. But by the time World War II had ended, the American people, their government, and their industrial leaders had accepted the necessity of federal government stewardship of the economy. The ensuing cold war only heightened the importance of this new responsibility. For this reason, in the context of the cold war, development programs took on a relevance that Taylorism did not. Development ideology did represent a conscious and ongoing effort by the United States government to impose an economic and political ethos expressly designed to counter subaltern acceptance of Communism in Latin America. Ultimately, though, development models have not been able to overcome the social, historical, political, and economic dynamics of the countries the United States has tried to assist, nor have they consistently served the ends of American presidents and their administrations.[21]

---

[21] See Williams, Tragedy of American Diplomacy; LaFeber, The New Empire; and Thomas J. McCormick, The China Market: America's Quest for Informal Empire (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1967). Alan Brinkley, The End of Reform: New Deal Liberalism in Recession and War (New York: Knopf, 1995).

Development was a peculiarly 1950s phenomenon. The United States emerged from World War II with unprecedented political, military, and economic power. According to Arturo Escobar, Americans in this period possessed an implicit faith in technology as the salvation for the world, and an unshakeable conviction in America as its savior. What began as the rationalization of production regimes under Taylor had grown to a nearly religious conviction that the technical and technological expertise of the United States possessed universal application. Fernando Henrique Cardoso charged that the literature on industrial capitalism has concentrated too much on management as a technical function and has ignored the dialectical power dynamic inherent to management systems. Cardoso argued that the bureaucratization of business and the depolitization of the economy was in fact "sociologically inconsistent" with power relations in a capitalist society. Nevertheless, Americans in the 1940s and 1950s exalted corporate structures and considered them the epitome of American economic supremacy. And in the midst of the emerging cold war, the United States viewed its administrative, technological, and scientific accomplishments as proof of the superiority of the American way of life. President Harry S. Truman, in his inaugural address in 1949, called on Americans to make use of their economic preeminence to help the unfortunate countries of the world. In an effort to help Americans make sense of the post-war changes to the international arena, and to satisfy growing anti-Communism, Truman divided the world between the developed and the underdeveloped, the rich and the poor. Development soon came to be understood as the process by which western nations would use technology to modernize poor societies wedded to traditional ways. Escobar decried what he believed was a

blatantly patriarchal and ethnocentric exercise that not only denied the sociocultural variability of Latin American cultures and the region's existing inequalities, it effectively removed “development” from the political realm to the scientific. Now, development was simply a technical problem to be solved devoid of politics.[22]

Since World War II, academics and policy makers have pondered the absence of modern-industrial economies in Latin America and elsewhere in the non-Western world. Many proponents of development programs in the cold war focused on the modern-traditional dichotomy, contending that less-developed economies existed in nations where more traditional value systems continued to hold sway. The pervasiveness of such traditional ways maintained corrupt corporate structures, which prevented Latin America from properly integrating itself into the world economy and limited national economic development. Economic growth, it was felt, would stimulate the national economic infrastructures necessary for proper development and alleviate the region's seemingly inherent political instability. Raúl Prebisch and the United Nations Economic Commission on Latin America in the early 1950s began the push for development in Latin America but argued that the region’s history posed unique developmental problems. Latin America, according to Prebisch, went from undeveloped before, to underdeveloped after, the Conquest because the new international division of labor reduced Latin America to a source of extractable raw materials. The subsequent inequitable

[22] Escobar, Encountering Development argues that the United States consciously created the development discourse to de-legitimatize Latin American necessities. Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Empresário industrial e desenvolvimento econômico no Brasil, 2d ed. (São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro, 1972), 23; and Escobar, Encountering Development.

international distribution of wealth prevented the now underdeveloped nations from building the complex economic base believed necessary for industrialization. State direction of the domestic economy and foreign capital were therefore seen as crucial to jump starting the development process. Few other proponents of developmentalism, as it was called in the 1950s, offered such cautions. Daniel Lerner touted his analysis of modernization in the Middle East as proof that western social sciences could pierce the veil of traditional societies. For Albert O. Hirschman, economics provided salvation for the underdeveloped world. Hirschman believed that the science of economics was no different than physics; universal economic laws applied across borders and therefore represented the essential tool for promoting development. While W. Arthur Lewis was less sanguine that Western models could be planted successfully, Lucien Pye gushed enthusiastically that his analysis of Burma in 1961 proved that development would work. Pye had not established a development program; instead, he conducted some interviews and deemed development likely for that country. Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal offered a more staid assessment in 1958, but assured that with appropriate central planning development projects should succeed.[23]

---

[23] Some stalwart developmentalists over the years include George Blanksten, "The Politics of Latin America," The Politics of Developing Areas, ed. Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), 455-531; Gino Germani, "Stages of Modernization in Latin America," in Latin America: The Dynamics of Social Change (London: Allison & Burby, 1972), 1-43; Kalman Silvert and Leonard Reismann. Education, Class, and Nation: The Experiences of Chile and Venezuela (New York: Elsevier, 1976); and Kalman Silvert, Essays in Understanding Latin America (Philadelphia: ISHI, 1977). See Raúl Prebisch, Towards a Dynamic Development Policy for Latin America (New York: United Nations, Economic Commission for Latin America, 1950); Daniel Lerner, The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East (New York: Free Press, 1958); Albert O. Hirschman, The Strategy for Economic Development (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958); W. Arthur Lewis, "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour," in Economics of Underdevelopment, eds.

Walt W. Rostow combined the many threads of development in his self-styled Non-Communist Manifesto into a powerful call to arms. What raised The Stages of Economic Growth far above every other work on development was that Rostow took his belief in a universal premise – that progress went through identifiable, predictable, repeatable stages – and explicitly connected that with his conviction that the United States could use development to stave off Communism in the underdeveloped world. Building on his 1953 work, Rostow charted economic development as a function of industrialization and technological innovation. Here, Rostow echoed his collaboration with MIT economist Max Milikin of three years earlier, when they wrote that there existed "common elements" that all developed western capitalist democracies possessed. In 1957 Milikin and Rostow wrote of underdeveloped nations that "no two of these countries are alike." That is why Rostow, on the first page of Stages, stressed the necessity of tailoring each development program to the specific country in question. But, since industrial development could be traced on an inevitable historical timeline, accelerating development was simply a function of identifying need and implementing appropriate planning. The purpose of development was to stimulate the requisite institutions – financial markets, a middle class, predictable monetary flows – for the

---

Aman Narin Agarvualu and S. P. Singh (Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1958); Lucien Pye, Politics, Personality, and Nation Building: Burma's Search for Identity (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962); and Gunnar Myrdal, Development and Underdevelopment (Cairo: National Bank of Egypt, 1956).

underdeveloped economy to "take off," to establish the institutional and infrastructural foundation to create the momentum necessary to make development self-sustaining.[24]

But Communist subversion threatened development at this vulnerable stage. Milikin and Rostow warned in 1957 that development programs would experience a "series of false starts" that would often require important political and social changes. It was during this tender, liminal stage that the "disease of the transition" loomed – Communism. In 1955, Rostow sought to apprise Americans of the stern task they faced in confronting Communism. Since the United States eschewed a military resolution – and rightly so as a moral people, he argued – the United States had to contend with the immoral excesses of our enemy in the battle for the third world. But Rostow remained convinced that America could meet the challenge. Rostow held the conviction that the United States represented a force for positive good, arguing that Americans needed to draw on its "limited but real margin of influence on the course of history." Development offered the way for a moral society to meet the challenge of Communism and aid the underdeveloped nations of the world. Economics would provide the scientific techniques; American commitment would see development through. In 1960, Rostow had the answer to Communist subversion – counterinsurgency.[25]

---

[24] Walt W. Rostow, The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960); idem, The Process of Economic Growth (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953); Millikin and Rostow, Key to an Effective Foreign Policy, 43, 47-8; and Rostow, Stages of Economic Growth, 17-28. See Michael E. Latham, Modernization As Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation building" in the Kennedy Era (Chapel Hill: Duke University Press, 2000), for discussion of the implementation of development in Southeast Asia during the 1980s.

[25] Millikin and Rostow, Key to an Effective Foreign Policy, 45; Rostow, Stages of Economic Growth, 162; Walt W. Rostow, An American Policy in Asia (New York: Wiley, 1955) viii, was a sequel to

A competing paradigm emerged in the cultural and intellectual ferment of the 1960s: dependency theory. While competing versions persist, the basis of this theory is that Latin America's so-called economic "backwardness" stemmed not from a lack of integration with the world economy, but from exploitive and asymmetrical global interrelationships which over the course of centuries have generated and perpetuated the region's dependent status. Dependent economies, which lack the self-sufficiency of "dominant" ones, depend on the external economic expansion of those "dominant" economies not only for economic growth but for mere survival. This is not a "structural-mechanistic" imposition of exploitive power over dependent nations, and by no means does this represent a recent phenomenon according to Fernando Henrique Cardoso. Indeed, Cristóbal Kay argues that the strength of dependency analysis lies in the emphasis on the dialectical nature of the dependent/dominant relationship. André Gunder Frank, Stanley and Barbara Stein, and Enrique Semo argue persuasively that the roots of Latin American underdevelopment lie in the Conquest and the subsequent colonial period. Historically, dependency has meant that Latin America has been forced to remain a source of cheap raw materials and agricultural products since the dominant economies have consciously thwarted industrialization. Celso Furtado, Fernando Novais, and Peter Evans conclude that Brazil's industrialization efforts in the 1950s still followed the pattern of dependent development. John Hall disagrees and believes that the deep-seated cultural values held by Portuguese and Brazilian elites perpetuated a clientilistic system

---

idem, The Prospects for Communist China (Cambridge: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1954); and Rostow, "Guerrilla Warfare in Underdeveloped Areas."

in which patrons dispensed benefits to clients in exchange for social standing and economic gain. While dependency analysis has been rightly criticized for an overtly reductive determinism that imputes motivation based on a presumed class position of Latin American elites as a group, rather than as individuals, Cardoso and Falleto correctly stress that the variety of responses in Latin America to the world economy reflects a complex interplay of competing social, political, and economic interests. But, as E. Bradford Burns points out, Latin American elites were not hapless victims in the process of underdevelopment. They welcomed extractive enterprises because they benefited the elites' social and political position.[26]

---

[26] Theotonio dos Santos, "The Structure of Dependence," American Economic Review vol. 60 no. 2 (1970), 234. On the debate within dependency, see Gabriel Palma, "Dependency: A Formal Theory of Underdevelopment or a Methodology for the Analysis of Concrete Situations of Underdevelopment?" World Development vol. 6 no. 7/8 (July/Aug. 1978), 881-924; and Raymond D. Duvall, "Dependence and Dependencia Theory: Notes toward Precision of Concept and Argument," International Organization vol. 32 no. 1 (Win. 1978), 51-78. dos Santos, "Structure of Dependence," 231 emphasizes the asymmetrical nature of the dependent relationship. Fernando Henrique Cardoso, "The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States," Latin American Research Review vol. 12 (1977), 14; Cristóbal Kay, Latin American Theories of Development and Underdevelopment (London: Routledge, 1989); Celso Furtado, The Economic Development of Latin America: Historical Background and Contemporary Problems, 2d ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 47-9; André Gunder Frank, "The Development of Underdevelopment," Monthly Review (Sept. 1966), 17-31; Stanley J. Stein and Barbara H. Stein, The Colonial Heritage of Latin America: Essays on Economic Dependence in Perspective (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970); Enrique Semo, The History of Capitalism in Mexico: Its Origins, 1521-1763, trans. Lidia Lozano (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993); Celso Furtado, The Economic Growth of Brazil (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963); Fernando A. Novais, "Brazil in the Old Colonial System," trans. Richard Graham and Hank Phillips, in Brazil and the World System, ed. Richard Graham (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), 11-55; and Peter Evans, Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multi-National State and Local Capital in Brazil, foreword Florestan Fernandes (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979). John R. Hall, "The Patrimonial Dynamic in Colonial Brazil," in Brazil and the World System, 57-88 argues for local determinants of underdevelopment. On the historical antecedents of Brazilian clientalism, see Raymundo Faoro, Os donos do poder: formaçâo do patronato politico brasileiro, 2 vols. (São Paulo: Editora Globo, 1975). [1959]. And Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Falletto, Dependency and Development (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), [1969]; and E. Bradford Burns, The Poverty of Progress: Latin America in the Nineteenth Century (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).

Students of democratization have argued that development models have failed because they do not consider the uniqueness of western capitalism. Critics charge that the "conditions" school of economic development refuses to consider the power that local political, cultural, and economic dynamics have to distort the model's effectiveness. Since 1982, Latin American nations have increasingly adopted neo-liberal, monetarist economic policies. Following the lead of Chile, Mexico has increasingly relied on economic technocrats to formulate state economic policy. But the lack of a complex physical and financial infrastructure in country after country not only deprives these market reforms of their vitality but also removes its relevance. Dankwart Rustow and Terry Lynn Karl have successfully argued that attributing causality to the descriptive characteristics of western models of liberal democracy cannot account for the dynamics of the democratization process. Adam Przeworski emphasizes that democracy is institutionalized uncertainty. In a democratic society, a multiplicity of interests compete within a regulated institutional framework, in which outcomes cannot be dictated. Not surprisingly, authoritarian bureaucrats abhor such a state of affairs. Predictability is their raison d'etre. In labeling the transition to democracy a compromise, Guillermo O'Donnell and Phillipe Schmitter follow in the intellectual tradition of Rustow, who argued that "insofar as it is a genuine compromise, it will seem second best to all major parties involved." Karl does well, then, to acknowledge the variety of forms that the democratization process can take. Rustow and Dahl highlight the historical rarity of democracy. Dahl found that the conditions for what he called "polyarchy" were "comparatively uncommon and not easily created." Rustow remarked that democratic

transitions follow no geographic, temporal, or social pattern. Institutionalizing uncertainty, after all, is a precarious undertaking. Most of all, development models ignore the violence that has marred the long democratization process in western countries.[27]

American businessmen and American policymakers embraced Taylor and Rostow's ideas because they provided the right conceptual tools at the right time. Each imbued their ideas with liberating characteristics that would free the work place and the underdeveloped nations from the weight of primitive ways. It is no mistake that Taylor wrote at a time of rampant nativism in the United States. The massive influx of southern and eastern Europeans at the turn of the twentieth century offended the Protestant sensibilities of Victorian America and seemed to bid fare to overwhelm the American Way of Life. These new immigrants brought decidedly alien ways of life, dress,

---

[27] David Pion-Berlin, "The Defiant State: Chile in the Post-Coup Era," in Armies and Politics in Latin America, ed. Abraham F. Lowenthal and J. Samuel Fitch (New York: Holes & Meier, 1986), 317-334; Antonio Ocampo, "New Economic Thinking in Latin America," Journal of Latin American Studies vol. 22 no. 1 (Feb. 1990), 169-181; Silva, "Technocrats and Politics in Chile," 385-410; and John H. Welch, "The New Face of Latin America: Financial Flows, Markets and Institutions in the 1990s," Journal of Latin American Studies vol. 25 no. 1 (Feb. 1993), 1-24, detail the failure of monetarist market reforms. Miguel Angel Centeno, Democracy within Reason: Technocratic Revolution in Mexico (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1994), examines the growing role of technocrats in Latin American society with a case study on Mexico. Dankwart Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy: Toward A Dynamic Model," Comparative Politics vol. II (Apr. 1970), 337-363; Terry Lynn Karl, "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America," Comparative Politics vol. 23 no. 1 (Oct. 1990), 1-21; Adam Przeworski, "Some Problems in the Study of the Transition to Democracy," in Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives, ed. Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, with foreword by Abraham F. Lowenthal (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 47-63; Robert Alan Dahl, Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971); Samuel P. Huntington, "Will More Countries Become Democratic?" Political Science Quarterly vol. 99 (Sum. 1984), 193-218; Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe Schmitter, Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies, foreword Abraham F. Lowenthal (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986); Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy," 357; Karl, "Dilemmas of Democratization"; and Dahl, Polyarchy, 32.

language, and faith. They even brought ideologies that threatened the very fabric of competitive – ideologically speaking at least – market capitalism. Scientific management gave owners the means to regulate the workplace, minimize the significance of workers' skill, and more efficiently generate profits while securing their control of the workplace. Walt Rostow emerged at a time when the United States found itself battling for control of the non-white peoples of the world. Communism attacked the legacy of colonialism and imperialism, and it found more than a few would-be patriots receptive to what American policymakers believed was an antithetical world view. Development ideology reconfigured the "primitive" and "traditional" societies of the third world to an economic status: underdeveloped. Progress simply had not yet transformed these societies into peaceful, democratic capitalist ones. Now, policymakers could employ mechanisms to stimulate the conditions necessary for that intrinsically anti-Communist development.

It is essential to remember that individual entrepreneurs and individual policymakers used scientific management and development because it served their immediate needs. Not everyone in the early twentieth century or in the 1960s, or since, embraced these ideas. And those that did adopt the ways of scientific management and development left significant portions out. Each of these innovators, Frederick Winslow Taylor and Walt Whitman Rostow, included essential caveats to their programs. For Taylor, owners needed to adopt the bonus system to provide workers with the necessary incentive to embrace decidedly monotonous work regimes and eschew the antics of labor organizers. Rostow could not conceive of development occurring unless security forces made active efforts to provide for the basic needs of the peoples who were prone to rebel.

In each case, they were ignored. American business loved the idea of experts ascertaining what workers should be doing and a stopwatch to determine how long a task should take. But American industry, as a whole, conveniently left out any bonus systems and pocketed the profits. Rostow conceived of civic action as the backbone to development but few security forces in Latin America would stoop to manual labor and American policymakers had a hard time spending the requisite monies to make it happen.

Most of all, Americans embraced the ideas of Frederick Winslow Taylor and Walt W. Rostow because each tapped into a deep well of capitalist notions of "progress." For Americans, progress has long meant the inevitable march of history and the continual expansion of civilization, of Christianity, of technological innovation. A true teleology, Americans have believed – have had faith – that progress would, because it must, because it had no other choice, push back the frontiers of ignorance, idolatry, and savagery. Frederick Jackson Turner did not invent it, but he did a remarkable job articulating the processional view of American history. His essay "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" encapsulated a view that Americans had embraced for centuries.[28] The turmoil of the 1960s and the social and political critics of that age fundamentally challenged the tenets of the American Way of Life and fostered competing views that have forced Americans to reconsider long-held truisms of American exceptionalism. Yet

---

[28] See Frederick Merk, Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation (New York: Vintage, 1963); and Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," in Annual Report for 1893 (Washington: American Historical Association, 1894), 199-227, in Frontier and Section: Selected Essays of Frederick Jackson Turner, intro. Ray Allen Billington (Englewood Cliff: Prentice-Hall, 1961), 37-62.

the power of that exceptionalism, the conviction of American greatness, still resonates deeply in contemporary society. The blatant boosterism and paternalism of John O'Sullivan's "manifest destiny" has modulated over the intervening decades. The symbols used to define America certainly have changed: railroads that cross the trackless wilderness, huge vats of molten steel, enormous turbines, skyscrapers that seem to pierce the sky, bridges to span chasms and rivers and bays, colossal dams to hold back the waters and harness the very power of nature, interstate freeways that crisscross the land to bring prosperity and ease, jets to ply the air and supertankers to ply the oceans, rocket ships that soar into the heavens, and computers. Language, too, has moderated the conceptions of progress as each generation has drawn upon its experiences to forge a vision of America that reflects their challenges, their dreams, and their historical context. Life in the early twenty-first century is far removed from that of the nineteenth, in pace, content, aspirations, and opportunity. But twentieth-century trumpeters of the American Way of Life – from Bruce Barton to Billy Graham to Jerry Falwell; from Theodore Roosevelt to John Kennedy to Ronald Reagan – have lost none of the expectation that America would be, and must be, great. Americans are God's chosen few. America could only succeed. That conviction sustained the men who forged American foreign policy during the cold war.

### THE LINGUISTIC TURN

The key to understanding how a culture transmits such conceptions as progress over time requires an appreciation of the role of language as both the medium and a mediator in that process. The "linguistic turn" in history represents an effort to use post-

structuralist ideas to reconstruct the past. The primary emphasis of the linguistic turn is the social construction of meaning and, therefore, the social construction of history. George Herbert Mead first lectured in the 1910s and 1920s, insisting that society was a complex and negotiated interaction of arbitrarily but systemically collected symbols – language. For Mead and his students, human beings can utilize language because they possess a "reflexive self" that enables them to actively interpret and define situations in which they are about to engage by "taking the role of the other." Individuals, regardless of age, learn appropriate behavior through repeated joint interaction with other social actors. They draw upon an ever-growing compendium of experience to define the social context. Then, people choose how to use language to interact by interpreting the likely response to their words before they engage in a specific interaction. Borrowing heavily from Freud and Weber, Mead postulated that humans combine a socially derived "me" with their innate individuality – the "I" – in order to define the socially contested "other," which enables them to consciously engage in negotiated joint action with other social actors. In a more recent commentary, Dominic La Capra challenges historians to deal with the meaning of the documents they purvey, rather than just to try to fill a niche in the historical record. He advocates the analytical use of rhetoric, which requires a sensitivity to the "dialogical" and "performative" nature of meaning, politics, and power in language that historical actors unfailingly employ. Such a perspective requires the historian to evaluate the problematic nature of knowledge. It further requires those

disinterring the past to attempt to identify the multitude of actors engaged in the construction of meaning in a given society, at a given time and through time.[29]

The renewed emphasis on language in history grew out of a larger debate concerning the nature of society and communication of culture. Structuralism emerged as a method of literary criticism in the late 1950s and early 1960s that sought, among other things, to replace the economic determinism of Marxism-Leninism. As a group, structuralists wanted to move beyond a reactive model and instead were "concerned with structures or systems of thought or culture." These "structuralists" differed from "structural-functionalists" who impute behavior as a function of social structures and institutions like "the family, the state, and the legal system." Understanding behavior for the structural-functionalist, then, becomes a process of identifying the relevant social function of the institutional framework in which an individual or group finds themselves.

---

[29] George Herbert Mead, Mind, Self, Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist, ed. with intro. Charles W. Morris (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), 44-5, 54-5, 160-1. Mead's students, Herbert Blumer foremost among them, collated their notes of his lectures and published them posthumously. Herbert Blumer, Symbolic Interaction: Perspective and Method (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1969); Susan Shott, "Society, Self, Mind and Moral Philosophy: The Scottish Moralists as Precursors to Symbolic Interactionism," Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences vol. 12 (1976), 39-46; P. D. Ashworth, Symbolic Interaction and Consciousness (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1979), 7-15; and William I. Thomas, "The Definition of the Situation," in The Unadjusted Girl (Boston: Little & Brown, 1931), 41-50 examine the "reflexive self." The dynamic process of symbolic interaction between social actors is detailed in Mead, Mind, Self, Society, 173-7, 192-6, 211-21; Andre J. Wiegert, Social Psychology: A Sociological Approach through Interpretive Understanding (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983), 138-40; Robert F. Bales, "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead," American Journal of Sociology, 72 (1966), 539; William Lewis Troyer, "Mead's Social and Functional Theory of Mind," American Sociological Review vol. 11 (Apr. 1946), 201; and Herbert Blumer, "Comment on Lewis's 'The Classic American Pragmatists As Forerunners to Symbolic Interactionism'," The Sociological Quarterly vol. 18 no. 2 (Spr. 1977), 286. See especially Sigmund Freud, The Ego and the Id, authorized trans. Joan Riviere (London: Hogarth, 1947); and Max Weber, The Interpretation of Social Realtiy, ed. and intro. J. E. T. Eldridge (London: Joseph, 1970). And Dominic La Capra, "Rhetoric and History," in History and Criticism (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), 15-44.

Walt Rostow falls squarely into this category. Rostow looked at the successful model of the United States to identify the crucial social institutions upon which modern industrial capitalism rested. Hence, he saw traditional countries without those conditions – those institutions – as "underdeveloped" and conceived of ways artificially to accelerate the "development" of the requisite conditions of modernity. Structuralists, on the other hand, adopted the position that "literature is an objective system" governed by "objective laws." They believed that certain themes persist in literature regardless of the time or place of their creation, or of the author's intent when creating a text. The appropriate focus, they argued, lay in decoding meaning contained in the relations the text describes. Language, it was felt, comprised a series of universal signs whose meaning could be ascertained with proper textual analysis. The motivations of historical actors in these models do not matter, since individuals do not need to be aware of the determinative power of the class, institution, or culture that defines their actions.[30]

The ahistorical determinism of structuralism has led to a new critique popularly labeled "post-structuralism." More recent literary theory privileges those methods that emphasize the inherent flexibility of meaning contained in written works. The shift reflects a larger concern for the belief in the "social construction of reality." Post-structuralists emphasize the dynamic process of human interaction and the variability of differential experiences and meanings. The key to understanding meaning lies in

---

[30] Peter Burke, History and Social Theory (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), 110; Terry Eagleton, Literary Theory: An Introduction (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), 91; Burke, History and Social Theory, 110-4; and Eagleton, Literary Theory, 91-126.

deconstructing the discourse of the participants. Discourse encompasses the communication process; it is indeterminate, arbitrary, variable, and, most of all, dynamic. Post-structuralists perceive anything written as "texts" as subject to the same analytical methods used in literary criticism. Since every written work is arbitrary, just as fictional as a novel, so the argument goes, political (or economic or cultural or institutional), analysis serves no useful purpose because it is but one of many often interrelated meanings that discursive constructs may possess. Language, for post-structuralists, had become objectified, merely a sequence of symbols; meaning could be found only in the dynamic interaction that forged the meta-language – discourse. Once again, though, people tend to get lost in all this discursive process. The meaning becomes the focus, not the historical context of the individuals who are doing the communicating.[31]

Michel Foucault and Joan Wallach Scott adopted the post-structuralist linguistic turn to explore elite control of power and their ability to define social relations. By the turn of the nineteenth century in France, Foucault writes, the "gloomy festival of punishment was dying out." He argues that an increasing concern for property broke down traditional relations and required a more systematic and less arbitrary way of enforcing political control. Foucault draws his conclusions not from traditional historical methods, but from a post-structuralist reading of representations in French literary works, government documents, personal accounts, and newspapers. From these he extrapolates broadly to Western Europe and the United States. While Foucault has been chastised for

---

[31] Burke, History and Social Theory, 150-8; Eagleton, Literary Theory, 127-50; and Burke, History and Social Theory, 120.

this expansive penchant, Burke more accurately criticizes Foucault for ignoring "the mechanics of change" in the process that he describes. An historian of early nineteenth-century French labor, Joan Wallach Scott's own feminist politics have led her to argue that gender supercedes class in analytical importance for labor history. Ava Baron, Gay Gullickson, and Alice Kestler-Harris note the particular importance of language in shaping, and being shaped by, the intricate interrelationships of evolving gendered social relations and power dynamics in working-class history. The key for Scott is the production of knowledge. She argues that language, as a constitutive element of this process, both mediates and reflects the historical context. In the nineteenth century, gender definitions suffused class and politics. Gender, in this model, does not merely interlace knowledge but also governs societal definitions, and, therefore, politics. While Scott makes a compelling argument for the integral manner in which gender defines political discourse, the inherently structural determinism of her model still limits – if not removes – human agency.[32]

Bryan Palmer offers a trenchant critique of what he calls the post-structuralist reification of language. Palmer states that "language is not life." He insists that

---

[32] Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1977), 8. [1975]; Burke, History and Social Theory, 151; Joan Wallach Scott, Gender and the Politics of History (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988); Ava Baron, "Gender and Labor History: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future," in Work Gendered: Toward a New History of American Labor, ed. Ava Baron (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), 1-46; Gay Gullickson, "Commentary:New Labor History from the Perspective of a Women's Historian," in Rethinking Labor History, ed. Leonard R. Berlanstein (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 200-13; and Alice Kestler-Harris, "A New Agenda for American Labor History:A Gendered Analysis and the Question of Class," in Perspectives on American Labor History: The Problems of Synthesis, eds. J. Carroll Moody and Alice Kestler-Harris (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 217-34.

interpretations of history "must be based" on analysis of material reality, class, and class struggle. He writes that historical materialism's attention to the importance of language predates what he decries as an often slavish attachment to discourse. Palmer argues that E. P. Thompson's understanding of the English working class depended upon language and its ability to reveal the "structure of hegemony" in English society. Palmer thoroughly chastizes Foucault's ahistoricism in Discipline and Punish. The reliance on language, not as a factor in the construction of social relations but as its determinant, traps Foucault into a never-ending reductive cycle of "discourse/power/knowledge." In so doing, Foucault egregiously dismisses the "subjectivity/agency/activity within which power undoubtedly lived." Palmer takes Joan Wallach Scott to task as well. He argues that, in seeking to avoid the "Marxist economism" and the "radical essentialism" of feminism, Scott overstates her case. Palmer calls for a return to the method of E. P. Thompson, who appreciates the ability of language to reveal the dynamics of class relations. While Palmer wants a return to a different determinism, his pointed commentary highlights a fundamental flaw of post-structuralist inquiry: the excision of human action.[33]

The insistence that historical texts are subject to a plethora, perhaps even an infinite number, of meanings and interpretations has roused the ire of a leading historian of Latin America. Florencia Mallon challenges the utility of post-structuralist methods

---

[33] Bryan D. Palmer, Descent into Discourse: The Reification of Language and the Writing of Social History (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), xiii-xiv; and ibid., 69. See E. P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (New York: Viking, 1963). Palmer, Descent into Discourse, 28.

like those that have been applied to studies of peasant resistance in India. Authors such as Ranjit Guha contend that insurgency literature on India has failed to appreciate the extent to which elite perceptions of India's subaltern peoples colored official documentation, the very sources upon which historians rely. Drawing on Barthes, Guha utilizes structuralist semiotic logic to analyze the language of historical texts to produce a post-structuralist interpretation of the imbedded code within the imperial discourse. He concludes that even radical modern authors have succumbed to what he calls the "code of counter insurgency," and that their works have been contaminated by culturally loaded descriptions which ignore the often complex processes that motivated millions of people. Mallon, though, argues that texts should be viewed as literary documents to be probed on their own terms, as well as constructs of a particular period. Like any good historian, she rightly decries "the privileging of textual analysis and literary sources" that cannot adequately replicate the necessary historical context derived from empirical research. Kevin Kenny does precisely that when he concentrates on how contemporary perceptions and depictions of violence attributed to Irish miners illuminate much about ethnocentrism and class warfare in mid-nineteenth century Pennsylvania. Now, he has a foil to explore how the life of the miners had to interact with the mine owners' code.[34]

---

[34] Florencia Mallon, "The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History," American Historical Review vol. 99 no. 5 (Dec. 1994), 1491-1515; Ranjit Guha, "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India," in Selected Subaltern Studies, eds. Ranjit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 37-44; and idem, "The Prose of Counterinsurgency," in Selected Subaltern Studies, 45-84; Guha, "Prose of Counterinsurgency," 70; Mallon, "Promise and Dilemma," 1508; and Kevin Kenny, Making the Molly McGuires (New York: Oxford, 1998).

As a constitutive element of the historical process, language both reflects and mediates the historical context. Studying the language used in the decision-making process that led to U.S. counterinsurgency training affords the opportunity to re-examine the ideological assumptions that underlay the Latin American policy of the United States. The constellation of ideas, notions, and beliefs that over time in American culture have ascribed inferior and frightening qualities to racial and racialized others – a language, an ideology of race – has dramatically shaped the course and content of America's foreign policy. That policy has in turn redounded across the centuries to profoundly influence those very conceptions of race. Understanding the place of race ideology in this history, therefore, helps us to understand the confluence of economic and security considerations that shaped the evolving cold war, because it explains the ease with which the United States – its people and, most important, its policymakers – embraced such an all-encompassing ideology of anti-Communism that dismissed – out of hand – the legitimacy of non-white peoples and their historical contexts across the globe. So when United States policymakers turned to Latin America during the cold war, individually and collectively, they drew on those profoundly paternalistic notions to implement military assistance and economic development.[35]

---

[35] For race ideology, see Gary Gerstle, American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Howard Winant, Racial Conditions: Politics, Theory, Comparisons (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 37-44; Evelyn Brooks Higgenbotham, "African-American Women's History and the Meta Language of Race," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society vol. 17 no. 1 (1992), 251-274; David Roediger, The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class (London: Verso, 1991); and Barbara Jeanne Fields, "Slavery, Race, and Ideology in the United States of America," The New Left Review no. 181 (May/June 1990), 95-118.

## CONCLUSION

The Cuban Revolution proved to be the watershed of U.S.-Latin American relations in the cold war and led a generation of policymakers to work assiduously to prevent its recurrence. The language used to justify counter guerrilla training, however, reveals the extent to which anti-Communism served to reduce political opposition in Latin America to a technical problem. World War II transformed America as it transformed the world political and economic order. In the immediate post-war period, the United States experienced a unique moment of unparalleled economic, political, and military preeminence, one that David Harvey contends fostered in the United States "the belief 'in linear progress, absolute truths, and rational planning of ideal social orders' under standardized conditions of knowledge and production." Americans in this evanescent period possessed an implicit faith in technology as the salvation for the world, and many held an unshakeable conviction that America was its savior. Development came to be understood as a technological process of modernization, a scientific problem to be solved. Disruption could only be the product of outside interference, in this case Communists and Cubans; experts in counterinsurgency would solve the problem of Communist subversion. The very language of development reflected and perpetuated these implicit assumptions. With counterinsurgency policy, the United States consciously employed "psychological warfare" as a technical term with security threats to be solved with appropriate management skills and training. Hence, policy makers during the cold war effectively obscured the ideological nature of each component of counterinsurgency training. They did so because Ché Guevara's Guerrilla Warfare

offered a competing discourse that threatened to undermine the new axiom of economic development and American influence. The School of the Americas became an instrument the United States used to ensure that Latin America had the requisite skills to enforce internal security and stymie Communist subversion while development proceeded apace.[36]

The U.S. Army School of the Americas serves as a useful interpretive vehicle. Human behavior is often predictable and repetitive; but it is not inevitable. Consequently, historians have to devise ways to explain behavior that occurs in a particular place and time. Social scientists prefer to use structuralist models and typologies that generally do not depend on context in order to categorize events, groups, and collective and individual behavior. Historians are not above utilizing a few generalizations in their efforts to interpret past human interaction. And that is precisely what history is – interpretation. Because historians seek to understand human interaction within its context, they must try to make sense of what is, intrinsically, unknowable. Instead, by asking questions of the available evidence, historians attempt to make "use" of the past to meet some present purpose.[37] The purpose of this endeavor is to make use of an examination of the U.S. Army School of the Americas to reveal some of the

---

[36] David Harvey, The Condition of Post Modernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 35. See Escobar, Encountering Development, for the development discourse.

[37] See Warren I. Susman, "History and the American Intellectual: The Use of the Usable Past," in Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 7-26.

important themes of U.S.-Latin American military and foreign policy during the cold war, such as: the formation of national security policy; the interplay of domestic politics and foreign policy; the role of the president in defining that policy; the interpretation and shaping of policy by the men and women who served in those administrations; the manner and purpose for which Latin Americans, especially members of their armed forces, partook of U.S. military policy and, in turn, the repercussions to their societies. In this case, the school is the interpretive wedge, the pry into the past. Through it, we learn that the School of the Americas filled only a nominal role in the U.S. Army training and doctrine command, and that economic development failed as a hegemonic project because successive presidents after John F. Kennedy did not give it priority in U.S.-Latin American policy.

But how historians define the "useable past" depends in large part on the analytical tools they marshal. The literature on U.S. military training and policy has benefited from historians who have emphasized economic and security considerations. Alone and together, those investigations have demonstrated the power of American hegemony and the complex interplay between the United States and Latin America. Studies of the Latin American military reveal their active and conscious participation in the process, drawing on their own notions of obligation and nationalism. Generally, however, the security/economics dynamic has obscured the legacy of American paternalism on United States foreign and military relations with Latin America. Race is a social construct. Like gender and ethnicity – and class – race derives its meaning from human thought and deed within a particular place and time. Each socially generated

conception in turn, and in concert, resonates profoundly with past shared meanings of race, class, gender, and ethnicity. Because it subsumes each of these categories in the historical context of United States history, paternalism becomes a category of analysis that has to be employed. Understand, this is not to advance paternalism as the new meta-narrative. Instead, given the history of western expansion, given the history of race ideology in the United States, given the lasting legacy of patriarchy and ethnocentrism, paternalism offers another tool to help provide a more useable view of U.S. foreign policy.

# Chapter 1:

## "Radios, Heavy Equipment, and Cream Puffs":

## United States Army Training of Latin American Military, 1939-1958

American desires to improve security of the Panama Canal during World War II had the unintended consequence of transforming the nation's role in the training of Latin American military. The fitful and limited training offered by the United States just before and during the war proved enormously popular among Latin American military establishments. Following the cessation of hostilities, the United States cemented the policy adopted during the war by establishing the Inter-American Defense Board in 1942 to coordinate U.S. direction of hemispheric defense. The Panama Canal and the sea lanes of the Caribbean, however, remained the only true strategic concerns in the Western Hemisphere, and once assured of their integrity, the Truman and Eisenhower administrations concentrated on Asia and Europe as the true areas of geopolitical significance. Latin America rarely mattered in the early cold war, and then only peripherally. The officers who ran the fledgling U.S. mission in the Canal Zone to train selected members of Latin America's military, however, sought to take advantage of the growing tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. In doing so, they fought the fiscal penury of the Department of Defense, the bias of the Department of the Army, and the competing efforts of U.S. military missions in Central and, especially, South America. Commanders in Panama also took care to ensure that the training offered at Ft. Gulick in the Canal Zone at the U.S. Army Caribbean School, founded in 1949, did not

challenge the preferred emphasis on military missions and U.S. armed forces schools in the United States. Instead, the school provided limited technical training to small numbers of military personnel from various Latin American nations at the request of those nations. To preserve their bureaucratic existence within the now vast military infrastructure of the United States defense establishment, the school championed its unique ability to influence admittedly minor players in a global concern, but in a strategically vital location.[38]

The USARCARIB School represented but part of a defense policy that used military training as a means to forge greater ties with members of a powerful Latin American institution – the military. The Latin American military became an increasingly decisive political participant in Latin America during the course of the twentieth century. By the close of the nineteenth century, the elites of Latin America had decried their nations' relatively subordinate position in the world economy and were pressing for "progress." That desire did not wane with the onset of the new century; instead, it grew. The Latin American military, long an active and influential player in the politics of the region, relied upon missions from France and Prussia in its efforts to modernize its military establishments in the early part of the twentieth century. Those missions evolved "in a manner that stimulated, rather than precluded, political action in the manner called professional militarism" and reinforced the perceived legitimacy, certainly among members of the military, of political action by the armed forces. Most of all, the military

---

[38] John Child, Unequal Alliance: The Inter-American Military System, 1938-1978 (Boulder: Westview, 1980), 40-4.

saw itself, institutionally, as divorced from the political process and therefore able to solve national problems without succumbing to politics and their attendant venality. The Great Depression proved especially devastating to the nations of Latin America, and the failure of political leaders to find an answer led Latin American militaries, in nation after nation, to insert themselves into the political process, often violently. Central America – Guatemala, Nicaragua, El Salvador – and South America – Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Brazil – all witnessed military coups (often several) of varying success. Only in Venezuela, Honduras and Costa Rica did the military not launch a takeover. And in Mexico, a succession of revolutionary generals served as president before 1940. By the beginning of World War II, the militaries of Latin America had become increasingly convinced, individually and collectively, that only they alone, as an institution, possessed the requisite morality and institutional vigor necessary to ensure national integrity and economic progress. And they welcomed exposure to the tactical superiority maintained by the United States.[39]

The army training at Ft. Gulick in Panama reflected the new priorities of the hemispheric defense posture the United States adopted during the early years of the cold

---

[39] See Frederick Nunn, "An Overview of the European Military Missions to Latin America," Military Affairs, vol. 39 (Feb. 1975), 1-7; Brian Loveman, For La Patria: Politics and the Armed Forces in Latin America (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1999), 63-100; Brian Loveman and Thomas R. Davies, Jr., eds., The Politics of Antipolitics: The Military of Latin America, 2d rev. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 17-88; Edwin Lieuwin, Arms and Politics in Latin America, rev. ed. (New York: Praeger), 1967; and John J. Johnson, The Military and Society in Latin America (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), 62-75. Loveman, La Patria, xi-xxvii; and Loveman and Davies, Politics of Antipolitics, 3-14, 89-162. See also Johnson, Military and Society in Latin America, 93-152 for a more complementary view. Willard Barber and C. Neale Ronning, Internal Security and Military Power: Counterinsurgency and Civic Action in Latin America (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1966), Appendix A, "Illegal and Unscheduled Changes of Heads of State," Part I, "By Country," [1-15].

war. The historically ad hoc nature of United States policy toward Latin America reinforced the intermittent nature of U.S. training of Latin American military prior to World War II. The United States Army, Navy and Marines played a direct role in the affairs of many nations in the Caribbean and Central America during U.S. intervention between 1898-1933. Local military commanders, who suffered from logistical and communication impediments and from a lack of concerted interest on the part of Washington, D.C., often decided policy on the spot in the areas under their command. Undersecretary of State for the American Republics J. Ruben Clark's memorandum of 1930 laid the diplomatic groundwork for an end to U.S. military intervention and occupation in Latin America when he argued that there existed no justification under international law for the practice and pattern of United States intervention in the preceding decades. President Herbert Hoover certainly did not dismiss American security considerations when he embraced the essentials of the Clark Memorandum. Instead, Hoover sought a less intrusive policy that would enhance American business opportunities and reduce the costs borne by the federal government. Led administratively by Sumner Welles and Nelson Rockefeller, a much more involved policy expanded and flourished under Franklin Delano Roosevelt when he launched the Good Neighbor Policy in 1933. Part of the United States's effort during the 1930s included a conscious effort to stymie further European influence in South America, especially that of Germany. But that desire did not extend to offering the military of the region consistent training at the hands of the United States military establishment. The onset of hostilities in Europe, however, spurred a bit more fitful action. And the post war-nuclear confrontation with

the Soviet Union meant that the United States could not afford uncertainty in the Western Hemisphere. U.S. armed services training of Latin American military became a useful tool in securing regional cooperation. In the years before the Cuban Revolution, the USARCARIB School was a small part of that program.[40]

[40] See Max Boot, The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 129-252; Thomas Schoonover, The United States in Central America, 1860-1911: Episodes of Imperialism and Imperial Rivalry in the World System (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991); Richard H. Collin, Theodore Roosevelt's Caribbean: The Panama Canal, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Latin American Context (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988); and David Healy, Driven to Hegemony: The United States in the Caribbean, 1889-1917 (Madison: University of Wisconsin, Press, 1988). For specific cases see Robert E. Quirk, An Affair of Honor: Woodrow Wilson and the Occupation of Veracruz (New York: Norton, 1962); Frederich Katz, The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, the United States, and the Mexican Revolution (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981). Combined, Jonathan Brown, Oil and Revolution in Mexico (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); and Linda B. Hall, Oil, Banks, and Politics: The United States and Postrevolutionary Mexico (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995), provide a thorough accounting of the United States, oil barons, and the Mexican Revolution. See also Hans Schmidt, The United States Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934, foreword Stephen Solarz (New Brunzwick: Rutgers University Press, 1995). [1971]; Brenda Gayle Plummer, Haiti and the Great Power, 1902-1915 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992); and Neil Macaulay, The Sandino Affair (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1967). On Cuba see H. Wayne Morgan, America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion (New York: Wiley, 1965); Philip S. Foner, Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of American Imperialism, 1895-1898, 2 vols. (New York: Monthly Review, 1972); Julio Le Riverend, La república: dependencia y revolución, 4th ed. rev. (Havana: Instituto Cubano Libro, 1975); José M. Hernández, Cuba and the United States: Intervention and Militarism, 1868-1933 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993); John L. Offner, An Unwanted War: The Diplomacy of the United States and Spain Over Cuba (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); and Aline Helg, Our Rightful Share: The Afro-Cuban Struggle for Equality, 1886-1912 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995). Lester D. Langley, The Banana Wars: United States Intervention in the Caribbean, 1898-1934 (Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1983). Alexander DeConde, Herbert Hoover's Latin American Policy (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951). Bryce Wood, The Making of the Good Neighbor Policy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961); Lloyd C. Gardner, Economic Aspects of New Deal Diplomacy (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964); Green, Containment of Latin America; Irwin F. Gellman, Good Neighbor Diplomacy: United States Policies in Latin America, 1933-1945 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979); David F. Haglund, Latin America and the Transformation of U.S. Strategic Thought, 1936-1940 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984); and Frederick Pike, FDRs Good Neighbor Policy: Sixty Years of Generally Gentle Chaos (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995). Frank D. McCann, Jr., The Brazilian-American Alliance, 1937-1945 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).

## LATIN AMERICA, JAPAN, AND THE CANAL, 1939-1943

The security of the Panama Canal remained the primary concern for the U.S. Army during World War II. Military planners believed that "practically the only objective of an enemy attack against the Canal Zone would be the Canal itself, with the purpose of capturing it for the enemy's own use." When President Roosevelt declared a national emergency in 1939, ordering the armed forces of the United States to upgrade the nation's defensive posture, the Canal Zone possessed few defensive facilities. Only the very limited capabilities of Ft. Amador stood as an impediment to enemy attack. Built in 1920 to defend the Pacific entrance, this facility housed the command structure of the various incarnations of the U.S. Army presence in the Canal until 1984. The site included a few rudimentary runways. By 1938, the army had constructed a more established air base named Ft. Albrook near the same site. During World War II, the army added a series of barracks, hangers, out-buildings, and runways, along with an air warning station. Given the logistical difficulties inherent in any full-scale attack, that must perforce come by sea, planners concentrated on defending against an effort to impede American use of the Canal. Consequently, they expected a "commando raid" as the likeliest scenario. Planners remained wary of German and Japanese communities in Central America, and in Guatemala in particular, as a potential source of guerrilla attack,

voicing a conviction that their mere presence presented a devious fifth-column threat to the Canal's security.[41]

The U.S. Army therefore sought to create a rapid-deployment, small-unit force of exceptional standing and ability to defend the Canal. According to army historians, training had suffered before the war, and they report that commanders complained that many soldiers who arrived in Panama did not possess even basic training. The extensive use of troops in construction as part of a broad effort to expand defensive facilities, housing, and roadworks, further hampered the ability of the United States to defend the Canal. Consequently, the Caribbean Defense Command launched a training program to acquaint troops with conditions in the Zone. Dubbed the "Panama Mobile Force," this unit "always had a definite mission which took precedence . . . the protection of the Panama Canal." The U.S. Army restricted training to the dry season so as not to expose the troops unnecessarily to malaria. Additionally, the United States worked to acquaint soldiers with the dangers of chemical warfare, deemed particularly likely in any attack on the Canal. Trainers, however, had to fight the Command Structure as well as the elements in their efforts to create the Mobile Force, battling to take students to Trinidad

---

[41] Historical Section, Caribbean Defense Command, War Plans and Defense, Caribbean Defense Command, 1946, HMF, 8-2.8 AE C1, 5; Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, "Training," Panama Mobile Force and Security Command, July 1946, HMF, 8-2.9 AF, Part IV, 1; Cecil L. Munden, Construction and Real Estate Activities in the Caribbean Defense Command, vol. 2, Construction of Individual Bases, Historical Section, Caribbean Defense Command, HMF, 1 July 1946, 8-2.8 AL V2, 40-1; ibid., 8; ibid., 429-53; Historical Section, War Plans and Defense, 6; Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, Caribbean Defense Command, History of the Panama Canal Department, vol. 1, Introduction and Historical Background, 1903-1939, 1947, HMF, 8-2.9 AA V.1 C.1, 80-9. See also Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, Caribbean Defense Command, History of the Panama Canal Department, vol. 3, The War Period, 1941-45, 1947, HMF, 8-2.9 AA V.3. C.1, 260-83. Center for Military History, Washington, DC. [Hereafter cited as CMH].

for exercises. British troops brought their colonial experience to bear and joined in the jungle warfare training in Panama and Trinidad. Small-unit tactics in the main were the focus of these programs. By 1941, the Mobile Force had become the core of the Jungle training program of the army, which later sent many men from the United States and Great Britain to Burma during World War II.[42]

The spirit of hemispheric cooperation led the Caribbean Defense Command to funnel requests for training from Latin American militaries to Panama. In February 1939 the Commanding General, Panama Department, Lt. General David I. Stone, "initiated a series of courtesy visits of military representatives of various Latin American countries." The United States military attachés to Latin American countries would extend the invitations. The visits represented a deliberate effort to "improve United States relations with neighboring nations and to promote better understanding with their armed forces." Army historians report that "these courtesy visits came at a time when Axis and Falangist propagandists in Latin America were reviving old distrusts of the 'Colossus of the North' and fanning the flames of hatred for the United States in the breasts of highly sensitive

---

[42] Historical Section, "Training," July 1946, 4-6; ibid., 1; Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, Caribbean Defense Command, History of the Panama Canal Department, vol. 2, Preparation for War, 1939-41, 1947, HMF. 8-2.9 AA V.2. C.1; Historical Section, History, vol. 2, Preparation for War, 1939-41; Historical Section, "Training," July 1946, 1; and Historical Section, History, vol. 3, War Period, 1941-45, 139-52; Historical Section, "Training," July 1946, 2-3. CMH. See cable dated 13 July 1943 in RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1941-1945, Box 821, FN 350.2; 16 Oct. 1942, "Summary of Report of Jungle Platoon Training of the 33rd Infantry at Trinidad, B.W.I. during the Period July 12, to August 22, 1942," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Comands, Caribbean Defense Command, 1941-1948, Box 115, FN 353 Jungle Warfare Training (Trinidad). National Archives and Records Administration II, College Park Maryland. [Hereafter cited as NARA II]. Office of the Staff Secretary, Caribbean Defense Command, Training in the Caribbean Defense Command, 1941-1946, 1948, HMF, 8-2.8 AC, 10-14; and Historical Section, "Training," July 1946, 7-9. CMH.

and nationalistic Latin American officer corps." They go on to note that the recent U.S. occupation of Caribbean and Central American nations had bred an easily inflamed "resentment," especially among the military.[43]

A number of Central and South American nations responded to U.S. overtures. Guatemala became the first nation to "accept the invitation" when it sent a "flight of ten officers of the Guatemalan Air Corps to visit Panama and the Zone," where they received a tour of the facilities. The War Department later felt it would be good for the Puerto Rican military to be given similar visits. In April, Colombia sent a similar delegation and then in November Ecuador visited, also to observe U.S. air corps facilities. The Ecuadorans requested some training by the United States, and General Stone devised that some "short course" be offered on their next visit in early 1940 to include "Air Corps methods and procedures in administration and supply, engineering, and tactical operations." By mid 1940, such extended courtesy visits had become more regular, generally "inspired by State Department representatives in the countries in order to foster good will." Early visits continued to be rather ad hoc, with a few short courses run by the air mechanics in supply and operations. When the Peruvian military requested more formal training, and Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Colombia, and Ecuador signed on, the army responded. Again, the primary training offered was in technical matters, from auto mechanics to parachute rolling.[44]

---

[43] Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 14. CMH.

[44] Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel in the Panama Canal Department," in Preliminary Historical Study, Panama Canal Department -- Training,

The Caribbean Defense Command continued to keep abreast of the politics of the various nations in the region, if only for security purposes. Situation Reports were a staple at CDC headquarters, and intelligence officers reported in the Fall of 1940 that the squabbling in Mexico over the recent election had subsided with only "minor sporadic armed clashes . . . in northern Mexico since September 1st" and the election of General Manuel Ávila Camacho. More conservative than his predecessor, Lázaro Cárdenas, the report went on to note that the new President-Elect had openly announced his devotion to Catholicism, which "encouraged conservative elements to believe that his administration will be divested of existing Communistic influences and that a regime more favorable to property rights throughout the country may be expected." Situation Reports from 1943 characterized the political scene in the Caribbean and Central America as favorable and concentrated on the ability of the army to ensure the security of the Canal without the threat of instability. The military coup in Bolivia in 1943 did impede participation of that nation's military in training in Panama but did not represent a strategic threat to the security of the Canal. To the contrary, military rule was deemed salutary to the primary mission of the Caribbean Defense Command. In addition to concern for the domestic

---

vol. 2, Department Schools, HMF 8-2.9 AM, 47-53; Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 17-22; and ibid. See also Maj. John Baker and Col. Charles D. Carle, Historical Section, Caribbean Command, United States Missions and Bases in Peru and the Caribbean Defense Command -- Period of World War II, HMF, 8-2.8 BF; and Historical Section, Caribbean Command, Cooperation and Collaboration of the Republic of Colombia with the United States in the Second World War, HMF, 8-2.8 BF. CMH.

political situation in the nations of the region, intelligence officers kept staff apprised of the weather, just in case.[45]

The transition of power in Cuba in 1944 revealed the impatience with which staff in Panama viewed Latin governments. Following the election of Ramón Grau San Martín as president in Cuba in 1944, the U.S. Army reported that relations between the United States and Cuba "had changed radically." Specifically, the debate centered on the post-war use of Batista Air Field, a field constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for which the United States and Cuba had signed a Secret Agreement giving the United States the right to construct roads and other ancillary services as it deemed necessary. Despite the previously cordial relations with the Cuban military on this subject, after the election Grau decided that the bases should revert to Cuba and not to let the U.S. have further use of them following the cessation of hostilities in Europe and Asia. The official U.S. Army history of relations with Cuba during the war notes quite acerbically that Cuba's seemingly obvious inability to maintain the fields "was not enough to deter Cuban officials of playing their own peculiar brand of politics involving delay and indecision." President Grau then became rather insistent that "only Cuban troops were desired in Cuba." Since the United States wanted to use these bases for heavy bombers in the postwar years, this attitude posed a problem. The matter was

[45] Sherman Miles, memorandum, 1 Oct. 1940, "Situation in the Caribbean Area, No. 5," RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1941-1945, Box 49, FN 336 Caribbean Defense Command thru 10-1-40. NARA II.

finally resolved to the satisfaction of the Caribbean Defense Command, but not without reinforcing, in their minds, the illegitimate intractability of Latin American politicians.[46]

The U.S. Army found its flexibility taxed in the training of its Latin American counterparts in Panama during World War II. Since the Caribbean Defense Command had not received additional personnel for the Latin American students, the army had to "superimpose the activity upon the existing departmental and command training programs by adding Latin American sections." Washington enjoyed the benefits accrued by training, but the Joint Chiefs did not want to pay for it. The army instructors also initially balked at giving courses in Spanish but "later became advocates of the idea." Occasionally, Washington took notice, such as when, under orders from Hap Arnold, the War Department arranged for a squadron of Brazilians to be trained in Panama in response to Brazil's request to be part of the war effort. Working with a variety of nations led to some interesting decisions. For example, Chileans were required to be paid in gold – a rather hefty raise for them – which army historians derisively note led to "spending sprees . . . of soap." Their enthusiasm consequently led to the loss of their commissary privileges at the Panama rest and recreational facilities. Still another report considered the students from Chile – sixty-six officers and thirty-one enlisted personnel

[46] Historical Section, Caribbean Defense Command, Cuba, 1946, HMF, 8-2.8 BN C. 1, 59-60. CMH.

in 1944 – "as a whole . . . more intelligent and industrious than any other students received" in Panama for training.[47]

Training of Latin American military also required the U.S. Army to confront its discriminatory practices. When the United States began incorporating troops from the Puerto Rican National Guard (PRANG) in 1944, army personnel in Panama complained that training did not progress as hoped because of the "language barrier, and low-mental capacity of troops," 37.9 percent of whom were classified as "Average Learners" and an additional 47.9 percent of whom were categorized as "Slow Learners" or "Very Slow Learners." PRANG soldiers were given training, but the army noted that the prevalent illiteracy required the trainers to be sensitive to their pride when instructing them. As a matter of policy, soldiers from Haiti and the Dominican Republic "received training from the Antilles Department under the Caribbean Defense Command in Puerto Rico." An army historian notes that in 1944 "two negro officers were accepted" by trainers in Panama for "Field Artillery training, as the Antilles Department was unable to give the instruction." This did not pose a "racial problem . . . as these officers were trained by an Insular Battalion that was in the field most of the time." Insular Battalions were composed of soldiers from Puerto Rico and U.S. possession in the lesser Antilles. The historian notes for the record that "Insular troops, through their racial background, have no feeling as far as color is concerned." Troops from Cuba also stirred animosity. While

---

[47] Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 69; ibid., 59; Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 15; and Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 75. CMH.

the army historian of record writes that there was only a "minimum of racial discrimination existent in Cuba, some of the personnel sent to Panama by that country had negro blood." U.S. Army trainers objected, as did "some students from other countries." Still, the army went forth with training, equitably it is argued, and "Black and mulatto Cuban personnel were accepted on an equal status, although reluctantly." The report concludes that "The color problem, however, was mentioned to the military attaché in Havana," who was responsible for selecting Cuban military for training by the United States in Panama, "and there was no further cause for complaint," presumably because the attaché excluded non-white students.[48]

**LATIN AMERICAN TRAINING IN PANAMA, 1943-47**

The Caribbean Command saw in the informal training program an opportunity to influence potential leaders of Latin American societies. General Brett, the commanding general of the U.S. Army Caribbean, believed the courtesy visits provided an entroit to the Latin American military and the general knew, perhaps better than most in the U.S. armed services, the often pivotal role played by the military institutions in Latin American political systems. By the spring of 1943 the original idea of token hemispheric cooperation had developed into a formal training program. Many of the early contacts were aimed at the development of goodwill among the Central American countries and Colombia. This continued to drive the army and, given the success of the missions, the

[48] Historical Section, "Training," July 1946, 31-2; Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 17-22; and Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 79. CMH.

Latin American Training Center was established "inconspicuously" on March 15, 1943. General Brett, the new commander of the Caribbean Defense Command, was glad to give the training his blessing as he worked to fulfill his primary responsibility, the defense of the Canal.[49]

Initially, the U.S. Army sought to provide Latin American military with the requisite instruction for the maintenance of Lend-Lease equipment, in particular that from the Army Air Force. Success led to expansion of the technical training programs, such as"motor mechanics, Aw gunnery, Aw fire control, armament, radio maintenance, mathematics review . . . internal combustion engine operation . . . radar and searchlight . . . radio operators." The first infantry training came at the request of Nicaragua, and in February of 1943 four officers from the National Guard arrived in Panama to receive infantry training along with U.S. troops, with the intent that they would take their new knowledge back to their armed forces. El Salvador did not send students to Panama until 1944, "when a limited number of students was enrolled in the program," with one officer and sixteen enlisted men receiving training at the Air School at Ft. Albrook. The army then decided that Latin American personnel, including the Mobile Force and Security Command, should be sent to all of the U.S. schools in the Zone to receive infantry/jungle training. Members of the Nicaraguan Military Academy received jungle warfare training in Panama beginning in 1944. The Panama Department of the Army "by 1 April 1944

---

[49] Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 14-5; Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, Caribbean Defense Command, History of the Panama Canal Department, vol. 4, The Reconversion Period, 1945-1947, 1947, HMF, 8-2.9 AA V.4. C.1, 72, 74; Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 55. CMH.

. . . had graduated 90 officers and 108 enlisted men from various courses." Added to this total were fifty officers of the Colombian War College, who received "two weeks of instruction with the Mobile Force." By January 1946, that number increased to 423 and "eleven different countries had been represented in attendance." The overwhelming bulk of the students came from countries along the spine of the Andes: Peru (96), Colombia (76), Bolivia (72), Ecuador (50), Venezuela (37), and Chile (25). Nicaragua and Guatemala sent eighteen soldiers each, and El Salvador nine. Cuba added sixteen. The United States flew in students from all over Latin America and the official report of the program notes that "the schools were found to bring personnel of the several countries together in common bonds of friendship, while the relations between pupils and instructors also promoted better understanding between the countries."[50]

The U.S. Army command in Panama consistently extolled the ability of U.S. military training to effect positive military relations. General Brett pushed for extended military missions to Latin American countries to cement military relations and to enhance the "prestige" of the training offered by Canal schools. In 1944, the American Republics Program, which included students from the militaries of Chile, Colombia, Guatemala,

---

[50] Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, vol. 4, Reconversion Period, 1945-1947, 72-3; Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 19; Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 54; ibid., 80; ibid., 55; Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 48-9; Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 57; Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, vol. 4, Reconversion Period, 1945-1947, 74; and ibid. See also request for training and travel in RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1946-1948, Box 823-8, FN 350.2 (12-15-41). NARA II; Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, vol, 4, Reconversion Period, 1945-1947, 73, CMH; and RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1946-1948, Box 829, FN 350.2, (6-17-40), which contains requests for training from Latin America back to 1939. NARA II.

Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela, represented "another outstanding service of the Command to foreign nations." This program gave cadres training to take back to the "six participating countries in the operation, care, maintenance, characteristics, and use of the war material allotted under the surplus program of the United States." Despite the difficulties reported by army personnel in working with Cuban students and the Cuban government, the official post-war assessment of U.S.-Cuban military relations during World War II noted that Cuban participation in U.S. Army training programs in the Canal Zone had not only taught "United States methods and proper care of United States equipment, obtained by Cuba largely through Lend-Lease arrangements," but had also done much to promote "friendliness between the two countries." "Satisfaction has been expressed" with the existing training program that "promise[d] to do much in the future to develop closer friendship between the United States and Cuba." The official history of the Panama Canal District goes on to wax rather rhapsodic about the ability of the Commander to foster inter-hemispheric relations, despite the "spread of undemocratic ideology among some classes of persons." The report further cited that "the importance of the Canal to both hemispheric and inter-ocean commerce remained unchanged in importance, and it was 'the crossroad' for inter-American solidarity and collaboration." Of course, the army historian made no mention of how the United States had acquired the Canal Zone.[51]

---

[51] Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 30; ibid., 49-50; Historical Section, Caribbean Defense Command, "Panama Canal Department Latin American Training Center," in Cuba, 1946, HMF, 8-2.8 BN C. 1; and Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, vol. 4, Reconversion Period, 1945-1947 76. CMH.

The exigencies of training Latin American military, however, threatened the ability of the army in Panama to continue this mission. U.S. training proved popular among some of the region's militaries. Countries in Central America, the Caribbean, and the Andean nations in particular took advantage of the training offered in Panama. Brazil, Mexico, and the nations of the Southern Cone, Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile, however, rarely did travel to Panama during World War II. As a matter of practicality, the army discovered that the apprentice system commonly employed in technical training did not afford the Latin American students sufficient training since few instructors spoke Spanish. Hence, staff at the headquarters of the Panama Canal Department at Ft. Amador decided to establish a separate school for Latin American students. Initially, in late 1944, this program received the designation Military Training Center, CDC-PCD, the Caribbean Defense Command, Panama Canal Department. Continuing demand from various nations in South and Central America and the Caribbean prompted the commander, General Brett, to seek a more permanent facility. To do so, the general needed official recognition from the War Department. And since Latin American governments routinely could not afford to send their troops to the Canal, the general needed something else to defray expenses – money.[52]

---

[52] Christy to Chief of Staff, memorandum, 14 Aug. 1945, "Authorization for Military Training Center, Panama Canal Department," RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1941-1945, Box 822, FN 350.2 (12-15-41). NARA II; Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 85-8. CMH; Christy to Chief of Staff, "Authorization for Military Training Center," (12-15-41). NARA II; Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 110-1. CMH; and Freeman to [Maj. Gen. Brett] COMGENCDC, memorandum, 7 Sept. 1945, "Authorization for Military Training Center, Panama Canal Department," attachment, Maj. Gen. Brett to Chief of Staff, letter, "Pan-American Training Division of Caribbean Defense Command," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Comands, Caribbean

General Brett launched a campaign in the spring of 1945 to make the ad hoc training of Latin Americans an established feature of the Caribbean Defense command. The general requested permission from the Chief of Staff of the Army to "establish in the Caribbean Defense Command a Pan-American Training Division." The Division would provide "basic and elementary training for enlisted men and junior officers of Latin America armies," and, as an added bonus, serve as "transition training and screening facilities for Latin American students scheduled to attend schools in the United States." General Brett took care not to challenge existing army schools in the United States when he stressed that "this plan is concerned primarily with those officers and enlisted men who are not specifically qualified, either by education or training, to attend school in the United States." Staff at the Pentagon quickly agreed with the "two phases" of the general's plan, setting aside schools in Panama for junior level training while preparing "senior officers and specialists, both officers and enlisted men," for training "at schools in the United States."[53]

Not surprisingly, cost quickly became a source of concern for the office of the Army Chief of Staff. While acknowledging the army's authority to formally institute such training pursuant to Congressional and Executive authorization in 1938, the Office

---

Defense Command, 1941-1948, Box 116, FN 353 Training of Latin American Personnel, Caribbean Defense Command, 1-3. NARA II.

[53] Maj. Gen. Brett (COMGENCDC) to COSUSA, 17 Apr. 1945, "Pan-American Training Division of Caribbean Defense Command," RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1941-1945, Box 52, FN 352 Caribbean Defense Command, 1; Blaine to Asst, Chief of Staff, 28 Apr. 1945, "Pan-American Training Division of Caribbean Defense Command," RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1941-1945, Box 52, FN 352 Caribbean Defense Command, 1-4. NARA II.

of the Chief of Staff for the Army wanted the military mission chiefs at the various embassies – who reported directly to the Pentagon and not to the Caribbean Defense Command – to control student selection and agreed to "furnishing transportation, housing, some clothing, (to be returned) but not mess." Brett responded that Congress in 1938 had authorized such training "without cost to the governments concerned." The current training, he admonished, "has been handled on a piece-meal basis," and therefore "any further delay in establishing a thorough and comprehensive program for all phases of such training would be unwise." General Brett reiterated that he wanted his superiors to be aware that "this plan is primarily concerned with those officers and enlisted men who are not specifically qualified, either by education or training, to attend school in the United States." The general continued to tout that such training was obviously superior for "exposing students not only to our military methods but to our social order." Again, the general sought to draw attention to the beneficial potential in training Latin American military. Given the marginal place of the Latin American training program within the U.S. Army, General Brett wanted to encourage his superiors in Washington, D.C., to keep open the opportunity to influence Latin American military in the post-war world.[54]

The commanding general of the Caribbean Defense Command received sanction for the Latin American School in early September 1945. Support for General Brett's position on funding came in early May when the intelligence officer to the Deputy Chief

---

[54] Schmidt to Ringold, memorandum, 5 May 1945, "Pan-American Training Division of Caribbean Defense Command," RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1941-1945, Box 52, FN 352 Caribbean Defense Command, 1-2; and Freeman, "Authorization for Military Training Center," 1-3. NARA II.

of Staff for the Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed that the United States should "provide air transportation to Panama from all parts of the Caribbean area and Central and South America." He added that the "Germans were most successful in bringing Latin America's officers to Germany, before the war, arranging for their transportation." Additionally, the G-2 officer rejected any effort to exclude Latin Americans without English skills, arguing that "under no circumstances should knowledge of English be a requirement. Such provision would make the plan useless before it even started." Furthermore, he gave his unqualified support to the Caribbean Defense Command when he insisted that "every effort should be made to provide mess -- as well as housing and transportation. . . . there is probably no more tangible and, in the long run, no cheaper propaganda than food for a man's stomach. It is a fact that lack of funds has been a major deterrent for most Latin Americans coming to U.S. Army schools in the past." Finally, General Brett's supporters felt that this training represented "the only answer to our future military relations with Latin America. Putting it into effect promptly is essential so that Latin America will not again turn to Europe -- including Russia." The Accounting General's Office grudgingly approved the plan but insisted that any monies disbursed would require detailed reports for precisely which students received precisely what training. And, the AGO ordered, the Caribbean Defense Command could pay for any school out of its existing budget.[55]

---

[55] Pabst to Ringold, memorandum, 1 May 1945, "CDC Proposal on Latin American Training in Panama Canal Zone," RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1941-1945, Box 52, FN 352 Caribbean Defense Command, 1-4; and Freeman, "Authorization for Military Training Center," 1-3. NARA II.

The Latin American Training Center opened its doors at Ft. Amador in early 1946. Army attachés at various embassies in Latin America continued to receive numerous requests for training at U.S. facilities, and funneled students as directed by the U.S. Army. The Latin American military preferred schools located in the United States, especially the Command and General Staff College at Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas. Occasionally, Latin American nations sought entrance for selected members of their military into West Point, the United States military academy, which the U.S. Army only rarely granted. With the emergence of the Air Force as a separate branch of the United States military soon after World War II, training in Panama quickly reflected this alteration to the "defense organization of the United States" when the Latin American Training Center was "divided into the Latin American Ground School and the Latin American Air School." The Mobile Task Force Command in Panama spurred on this division when it requested, and received, permission for the "establishment of a separate Infantry School with a special teaching staff." The fitful infantry training offered during the war had been left to the 295th Puerto Rican Infantry Regiment. The Task Force Command believed that only in this way could "an efficient infantry training program . . . be realized" to properly train the "Latin American officers who were scheduled to arrive in Panama in early 1946 from several Central and South American republics." Staff at the headquarters of the Caribbean Defense Command were pleased to report that "little effect on the training was evident" as a consequence of this shift.[56]

---

[56] Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 115. CMH; RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1946-1948, Box 820, FN 350.2 (7-13-46). See various

Not surprisingly, the Caribbean Defense Command continued to praise its training programs, contending in a summary of 1946 activities that "the Latin American Training school definitely established closer relations between the Armed Forces of the United States and the armies of the nations participating in the program." The experience of the army at the new facility mirrored the training regimen of World War II. Latin American students at the Latin American Ground School received training very similar to that of their U.S. counterparts. Trainers used an array of U.S. Army manuals such as those from the U.S. Army Armored School at Ft. Knox, Kentucky, and the Infantry School at Ft. Benning, Georgia. A selected handful of officers and enlisted men from Colombia, Venezuela, El Salvador, and Honduras received "basic engineering" training, primarily in the use of heavy equipment for road construction, and a few students from Costa Rica received "basic weapons" training to take back home. By spring of 1947, staff in Panama touted the numbers of Latin American military "graduated from courses in our Latin American schools . . . four hundred ninety-six (496) officers and six hundred fifty-six (656) enlisted men." While the U.S. Army concurred in spirit, it worried that "in the interests of fostering good will and mutual understanding between Latin-American countries and the United States, it would be highly undesirable to remove Latin-

---

cables in RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1946-1948, Box 95, FN 35211 Command and General Staff College. NARA II; Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 116; Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools 100-1, 109; and Office of the Staff Secretary, Training, 1941-1946, 116. CMH.

American students from United States Training Schools for language difficulty or inability to absorb the required training."[57]

The language skills of Latin American military students proved to be a problem for the U.S. Army. The army had received numerous complaints from its schools to the effect that the limited English language skills of Latin American soldiers and officers greatly hampered instruction. These were often thinly veiled attacks on the intelligence of the troops in question. To curtail this problem, the army wanted its military missions in Latin America to work harder with their host countries to ensure that only qualified applicants were advanced and that they, the mission chiefs and their attachés, provided proper English training for prospective students. In Panama, the Caribbean Defense Command sought to provide Spanish language training whenever possible. Doing so, they argued, impressed the Latin American military and greatly enhanced the "benefits accruing to the United States from this new attitude on the part of the Latin Americans [which] might be far reaching." The Caribbean Defense Command emphasized the potential of U.S. training to affect future hemispheric relations. They concluded that "A lasting good impression carried away by Latin American military students is not only

---

[57] Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 112. CMH. For training manuals from the Armored School at Ft. Knox, see RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1946-1948, Box 819, FN 350.2 (7-13-46); and for manuals from the Infantry School at Ft. Benning that were employed by trainers in Panama, see RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1941-1945, Box 818, FN 350.2 (7-13-46). Bonesteel to Director of Organization and Training, 3 Apr. 1947, "Central and South American Students Attending School in Panama," RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1946-1948, Box 93, FN 350.2 U.S. Army Caribbean School, 1947. NARA II; and RG 319 Records of the Army Staff, Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1946-1948, Box 817, FN 350.2 1 Jan. 47 thru 31 Dec. 48. NARA II.

important to the United States at the present time, as many of these young officers will in the future occupy positions of influence in their respective armies, and perhaps even in their governments." The generals in Panama never lost sight of the willingness of Latin American military to insert themselves into their nations' politics, or the potential for U.S. military training to serve the United States in the coming years.[58]

**U.S. ARMY CARIBBEAN SCHOOL**

The United States believed that the emerging cold war required modifications to its policy toward Latin America. The United States served notice of the limited role to be played by Latin America with the Río Pact of 1947, which established a mutual defense network among the signatories. The following year at the Bogotá conference, the United States pushed for, and secured, the creation of the Organization of American States. In doing so, the United States sought to forge an alliance that satisfied Latin American demands for non-intervention while it secured mutual defense cooperation. Latin America looked forward to an era in which the OAS would be the mechanism for the nations of the hemisphere to relate as sovereign entities. The United States, on the other hand, wanted to create the political framework necessary to prevent regional conflicts and preserve hemispheric security in the face of growing tension with the Soviet Union. The language of these two meetings stressed cooperation and mutual defense; in practical terms, the United States made it clear that Latin America was expected to present a

[58] Historical Section, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel," Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, 112. CMH.

unified, anti-Communist front. Latin America acceded to the Río Pact because many of the countries that signed believed that the United States would then make good on its pre-war promises of return to the mutually beneficial economic relationships developed under Franklin Roosevelt. Between the Río and Bogotá meetings, however, American priorities changed. Secretary of State George Marshall abruptly told Latin Americans at Bogotá that, despite their sacrifices during the war (Latin America provided the United States critical raw materials at below-market prices), no such trade package for the region would be forthcoming. The hardening lines of the cold war dictated that Europe receive U.S. foreign assistance and preferential trade agreements. While Washington would have preferred American solidarity, all that Marshall required of Latin America was support for hemispheric defense. Under Dwight Eisenhower, "hemispheric defense" solidified as United States policy. Eisenhower wanted Latin America to be a comfortable backwater of the cold war. Military training appeared a good way to secure Latin American cooperation and keep the hemisphere secure.[59]

The new hemispheric defense posture changed the purpose for training Latin American military in Panama. Training in Panama in 1944 still came under the rubric of the Caribbean Defense Command headquartered at Ft. Amador. The Joint Chiefs of Staff changed that when they redesignated the Caribbean Defense Command the U.S. Army Caribbean Command on Nov. 1, 1947. The term "defense" was dropped from the official nomenclature because it did not capture the proactive character the army wished to

[59] See Loveman, La Patria, 143-5; Child, Unequal Alliance, 99-102; Green, Containment of Latin America, 283-6.

convey in the post-war period. The change represented a cold war decision that sought to update the entire defense posture of the United States along more global lines. The emerging hemispheric defense policy of the United States called for the new Caribbean Command to secure the Panama Canal and the Caribbean shipping lanes, as well as to coordinate training of Latin American military throughout the region. In reality, Washington would direct military training and the Caribbean Command would have the honor of processing the paperwork. As part of the change, the U.S. Army moved its training of Latin American military to a remote outpost on the east coast of the Canal Zone. As they had so far, the U.S. Army continued to provide primarily technical training, radio repair, heavy equipment operation and maintenance, and small arms repair. In time, the USARCARIB School, as it was called, would expand its offerings both in response to Latin American demand and to bolster the position of the school within the U.S. Army. Most of the military students who attended school in Panama came from the U.S. Army. But over time, an increasing percentage of the student body at the USARCARIB School came from Latin America.[60]

The new USARCARIB School soon discovered that it would have to find students in Latin America if it were to survive. On February 1, 1949, "all Canal Zone service schools were consolidated and moved to Fort Gulick." According to a 1970 Military Review article prepared by the school, Ft. Gulick initially served as an "anti-aircraft post situated five miles inland from the Atlantic entrance to the Canal." Army

[60] Child, Unequal Alliance, 120.

historians, however, wrote in 1946 that "Ft. Gulick originally served as the primary medical facility for the Canal Zone and housed the 368th Station Hospital." Both attribute the Fort's name to the outgoing Panama Department Commander, Major General John W. Gulick. General Gulick received the Distinguished Service Cross and the Legion of Honor from France during World War I. As a young officer, General Gulick served as Military Attaché to Chile from 1911-1916, where he also served as an instructor to the Chilean Army. The Chilean Army awarded him the Order of the Condor for his service. The army relied on "civilian labor" to construct the facility that "originally called for a 250 bed hospital and staff of 36 nurses and a brigade of 190 men and officers." Fort Gulick "remained a rather primitive affair with only the ancillary services needed for the hospital and the few troops stationed there during the war," with only one 500-gallon tank of gasoline to last the post for a year. Still, the army planned to use the hospital for those soldiers in transit from Europe to Asia after VE day who were in need of medical care. Now, the aging outpost would serve as the primary instructional facility for Latin American and U.S. soldiers in the Canal Zone. But the majority of students remained American. For example, in 1949, "743 North Americans and 195 Latin Americans" graduated from the school. But, that began to change in 1949 when troop reductions in the Canal Zone "coupled with an increased demand by Latin American governments for schooling" led the U.S. Army to gear its program exclusively to non-U.S. personnel.[61]

---

[61] USARSA, "U.S. Army School of the Americas," Military Review vol. 40 no. 4 (Apr. 1970), 89; Cecil L. Munden, Construction and Real Estate, vol. 2, Construction of Individual Bases, 2. CMH; ibid;

Not every Latin American military routinely sent students to the USARCARIB School. All of the nations that comprise Latin America did send some students to Ft. Gulick between 1949 and 1959. But the school served some countries much more so than others. Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico did take part in training at the USARCARIB School. They just did not do so very often. Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico, along with Uruguay, Chile, and Peru, all had respected military academies and colleges. The military from these nations welcomed U.S. military missions to their countries and U.S. armed forces personnel as instructors at their service schools. Latin Americans prized slots at the important U.S. service institutions, such as the Naval War College, the Army War College, the Command and General Staff College. The United States Joint Chiefs of Staff preferred these latter two options as the most effective schools to instill U.S. military doctrine. In the case of Brazil, the United States assisted in the creation and development of that country's preeminent military institution in 1951, the Escola Superior de Guerra. American foreign aid and American advisors helped design the building as well as the curriculum, which was patterned after the U.S. Army War College. The United States armed forces forged the closest relationship with Brazil of all

---

and "U.S. Army School of the Americas," Military Review, 89; El Faro Americano vol. 2 no. 1 (Jan. 1962), RG 498 U.S. Army Caribbean School [School of the Americas], Box 1, FN 205-02 Publications Records Sets, 1963, 10. NARA II; Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, vol. 2, Preparation for War, 1939-41, 69; Cecil L. Munden, Construction and Real Estate, vol. 2, Construction of Individual Bases, 2; Leigh C, Stevenson, Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, Preliminary Historical Study, Panama Canal Department -- Supply, HMF 8-2.9 AK, 124; Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, vol. 3, War Period, 1941-45, 284-92. CMH; and "U.S. Army School of the Americas," Military Review, 89.

the Latin American military through this institution.[62] But ever sensitive observers of status themselves, the Latin American military knew that the USARCARIB School functioned on a fairly low level within the U.S. training regime. Most of the school's Latin American military students came from the northern Andean countries, Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela, the Caribbean, and from Central America, Costa Rica, Panama, and Nicaragua. And the elites located at the northern- or southern- most tips of Latin America generally perceived the people from these regions as vastly inferior, racially, culturally, and, of course, militarily. They simply did not share the same pedigree. For these reasons, many from the more established militaries were reluctant to participate in training that they believed demeaned them.

The USARCARIB School enhanced its offerings in 1952 to encourage more diverse Latin American attendance. The school continued to promote its training as a means to facilitate greater cooperation with Latin American military. The school, though, in its 1952 catalog of courses, cited as one of its "principal missions . . . to offer a wide variety of military courses designed to train well-qualified military instructors, small-unit leaders and specialists capable of instructing and performing duty in their individual fields." The army included in the course offerings training in "clerical," "unit supply," "track vehicle mechanic," "motor officers and sgts.," "radio operators," "cooking," "mess management," "mess administration," "officers leadership," and "noncommissioned officers leadership." The USARCARIB School conducted these

---

[62] Sonny B. Davis, Brotherhood of Arms: Brazil-United States Military Relations, 1945-1977 (Niwot, CO: University Press of Colorado, 1996), 93-115.

courses in English using U.S. Army regulation field manuals and advertised them as such. The school's commandant, Colonel Myron P. Smith, reported to the army in June 1952 that courses on "wheel vehicle mechanic," "engineer," "infantry," "weapons," "communications officer and chief," "radio maintenance," "tactics," and "military police" were taught in Spanish, with the latter of these also taught in English. Part of the training the U.S. soldiers in Panama received that their Latin American counterparts did not concerned atomic war and fallout. As part of its "radiological defense training," the army assured instructors that "there is little likelihood of danger due to the contamination of the ground about the zero point with radioactive residues after the air burst. . . . Unless there were some unusual meteorological conditions, such as a heavy rainstorm, it is not believed that the residual radiation, following an air burst, would ever be dangerous."[63]

On a lighter, but still illustrative note, courses for cooks, mess supervision and administration remained one of the more consistent programs offered at the USARCARIB School during the 1950s. In October 1952 the school's Commandant, Col. James M. Pumpelly, politely informed his commanding officer that the lack of a "suitable dining facility" for "student officers of the USARCARIB School" posed something of a problem. "Latin American officers", he wrote, "are not accustomed to dining in the same

---

[63] "Introduction," The USARCARIB School Catalog, 1952 (Ft. Gulick, C.Z.: USARCARIB School, 1952), RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 12 Admin 1951-52, FN 352 USARCARIB, iii, v; Myron D. Smith (Commandant), letter, 24 June 1952, "Classroom Hours per Day," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 12 Admin 1951-52, FN 352; and Panama Area Damage Control School, Radiological Defense Training, Phase III, RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 12 Admin 1951-52, FN 352 (PADCS). NARA II.

area as enlisted personnel." Indeed, the USARCARIB School Commandant told the commanding general of the U.S. Army Caribbean that "the serving of Officers in The USARCARIB School troop mess has always been a source of complaints and grievances by Latin American officer personnel." Establishing an officer's mess should alleviate this problem, especially, he continues, "due to the continued large student enrollment." But "this should not pose an undue burden," he concludes, because "the Food Service Division of The USARCARIB School is prepared to provide sufficient qualified student personnel for its operation" who benefited from such courses as "pastry chef."[64]

The school continued to tout its ability to foster better hemispheric relations via the training of Latin American military. The school continued to keep abreast of activities of the region's U.S. military missions and Military Assistance and Advisory Groups, or MAAGs. Those missions often required the U.S. military to adjust to life in their host nations. In January 1952, the Chief of the U.S. military mission in Cuba requested funds to permit one officer and one enlisted man to attend Cuban military clubs. His reasoning that "normal duty will require considerable social contact with Cubans both militarily and civilian (since the Cuban military is more closely associated than are the American services)," warranted government funds for the soldiers in question. And those missions continued to serve as the critical conduit for students. To further cement good relations, the school arranged an Americas pistol competition in

[64] Pumpelly (Commandant USARCARIB School) to COMGENUSARCARIB, letter, 10 Oct. 1952, "Establishment of an Officer's Field Mess at Fort Gulick, C.Z.," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 9 Admin 1951-52, FN 331.2 Officers Club, 1952, 1-2. NARA II.

October 1952, arguing, with no hint of self-consciousness, that "a shooting competition with various nearby Latin American countries would be desirable as a means of cementing friendly relations and promoting better understanding between members of our Army and members of the neighboring armies." And in November of that year, the U.S. Army Caribbean arranged a visit to the Colombian War College. In these ways, the school sought to fulfill its paramount mission, which was "to contribute to the development of mutual comprehension and good will between the Armies of the American republics."[65]

The new Commandant at the USARCARIB School in 1953 lamented the limited influence of the school on future politics in the region. The United States needed cooperative allies in Latin America. For years now, the U.S. Army officers in charge of training Latin American military had emphasized the ability of military training to foster closer relations with some of the region's future military leaders. The Eisenhower administration encouraged this view, and leaders at the USARCARIB School did their best to promote training at Ft. Gulick as a means to help secure that cooperation. Colonel

---

[65] See for example RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 8, Admin 1951-52, FN 319.1 Mission Reports, 1951-1952; and RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 10 Admin 1951-52, FN 331.1 Missions, 2 Binders. Hoover to COMGENUSARCARIB, letter, 10 Jan. 1952, "Membership in Cuban Clubs," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 9 Admin 1951-52, FN 331.2, Officers Club, 1952; RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 12 Admin 1951-52, FN 352 USARCARIB (Latin American Students); Daniel Still (Commander) to COMGENUSARCARIB, letter, 16 Oct. 1952, "Rifle and Pistol Competition with Latin American Countries," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 12 Admin 1951-52, FN 3533 (Chronological); RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 12 Admin 1951-52, FN 352 USARCARIB (Latin American Students); and USARCARIB School, "Introduction," The USARCARIB School Catalog, 1952 (Ft. Gulick, C.Z.: USARCARIB School, 1952), RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 12 Admin 1951-52, FN 352 USARCARIB, iii. NARA II.

Taylor, however, informed his commander on the Pacific side of the Canal Zone that the school had "in its four and one-half (4 1/2) years of operation . . . trained seven hundred and thirty-four (734) officers and one thousand one hundred and thirty-eight (1138) enlisted men of seventeen (17) Latin American Republics." Most of these military students came from Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, and Nicaragua. Unfortunately, Commandant Taylor added, "the majority of such students have been below the grade of Captain, with the greater portion of the officer students being in the grade of lieutenant or cadet." The colonel's concern stemmed from his conviction that "while undoubtedly a favorable impression has been made on such personnel," in the course of their training by U.S. military at the facility in Panama "the influence of such officer in the military and, indirectly, political policies of their countries, is limited as they are not, in most cases, in a position to make their opinions or views felt." He warned that "by the time such officers have reached positions of great responsibility in their countries, fifteen (15) or twenty (20) years from now, many will have had their viewpoints altered by the now senior officers of their armies or will have passed from the military picture of their nations." Colonel Taylor, therefore, requested permission to establish courses for senior grade officers. This would put the USARCARIB School in direct competition with programs such as those at the Command and General Staff College, something that the army did not want to occur. But, Colonel Taylor argued, "an attempt should be made to reach the more influential levels of the Latin American Armies." Of course, by "influential" the colonel referred to those officers able to insert themselves into the political process. Thus, Colonel Taylor concluded, "it is believed that the proposed

course would serve to . . . create closer liaison with the neighbor armies, and to promote hemispherical solidarity by giving all armies a common understanding of staff procedures." Most of all, such a course would "increase the influence of the United States in Latin America."[66]

Colonel Taylor's admonition seemed pertinent given the consistent high demand by the Latin American military for training. The attaché in Chile forwarded the request of a Chilean Air Force major "concerning the possibility of his spending about a year as an observer with the Anti-Aircraft Artillery, U.S. Army." Tension, however, between the military missions and the USARCARIB School continued. This was demonstrated in August, 1953 when a U.S. officer in Colombia forwarded that army's request for antiaircraft training to the Office of the Commanding General of the U.S. Army Caribbean. And it was not uncommon for military missions to request training materials prepared by the USARCARIB School, as they did in late 1953 when Captain Shattuck asked that "this mission be furnished lesson plans for all subjects listed in Program of Instruction for Wheel Vehicle Mechanic Course (Spanish), The USARCARIB School, Fort Gulick, CZ dated 1 June 52." The correspondence, which noted that "Colombian Government prepared to utilize 40 spaces in Antiaircraft Artillery course commencing in September," was forwarded to Ft. Gulick. Honduras requested company level training in the spring of 1953, but the military attaché in Tegucigalpa felt that the expected use by

[66] Colonel Taylor (Commandant) to CGUSARCARIB, letter, 14 Aug. 1953, "Latin American Regimental Command and Staff Course at the USARCARIB School," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 352 U.S.AR-LAS, 1. NARA II.

the Honduran Army of this training posed "a tactical problem" and he "requested that it be reviewed and your comments and/or recommendations submitted to this headquarters." And Guatemala requested training for a pair of officers each "to attend Infantry Weapons Course reporting 21 Aug. and . . . for Tactics course reporting 30 Oct." Occasionally, the USARCARIB School had to make adjustments to handle the demand. In the fall of 1954, the school added a military police course for Ecuadorian students, since "the capabilities of the Military Police division of the USARCARIB School will not permit the enrollment of eighty (80) Ecuadorian students in a single class." The USARCARIB School Commandant, Colonel Meeks, assured the Chief of the Military Mission to Ecuador that the curriculum for the special class "will be identical to the standard Military Police Course offered at the USARCARIB School." Occasionally, members of the United States' Congress visited the military missions to Latin America, and added their weight to Latin American requests for training.[67]

---

[67] See RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 352 U.S.AR-LAS; RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 51, FN 350.2 Binder #1; and RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 52, FN 352 (USARCARIB), Binder #1. Ross to Army Attaché, Chile, cable, 23 Oct. 1953, "Anti-Aircraft Training," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 350.2; Shattuck to CGUSARCARIB, letter, 27 Oct. 1953, "Request for Lesson Plan Material (Wheel Vehicle Maintenance)," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 352 (USARCARIB), Binder # 1; Turner to CGUSARCARIB, cable, 11 Aug. 1953, RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 352 (USARCARIB), Binder # 1; Dalton to Commandant (Col. Taylor), letter, 10 Apr. 1953, "Company Attacks to be Utilized by Honduran Army," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 32, FN 353 (General), Binder # 1; CGUSARCARIB to Chief U.S.ARMIS Guatemala, cable, 6 Aug. 1953, RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 352 (USARCARIB), Binder # 1; Meeks to Chief, Military Mission to Ecuador, cable, 11 Sept. 1954, "Special Military Police Course," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 52, FN 352 (USARCARIB), Binder #1; and RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 51, FN 337, Visits, Binder #2. NARA II.

Latin America had consistently sought more specialized training from the United States to enhance internal security. Eisenhower knew that Latin American military routinely overthrew the democratic process in their countries. The president, however, wanted regional security above all else. He also accepted that the military could provide that security best. So when the number of requests from the Far East, the Near East, Europe and Latin America for counterintelligence training increased significantly during the mid-1950s, the Eisenhower administration responded. In May 1956, the commanding general of the U.S. Army Caribbean, Lt. Gen. W. K. Harrison, pushed for the establishment of a counterintelligence program at the USARCARIB School. Senior staff for the assistant secretary of defense for internal security affairs concurred, and argued that "In Latin American nations, government stability is determined largely by the loyalty, efficiency, and orientation of the armed forces. This condition points to the urgent need for proper training of selected personnel from the Tri-Services of each country, in the principles of intelligence and counterintelligence, to insure maximum possible protection from the infiltration of Communists and other subversive elements." General Harrison's adjutant cited requests from Colombia, Paraguay, Venezuela, and Ecuador as evidence that the region's defense required counterintelligence training. The Eisenhower administration, however, felt that "an Intelligence course established in the USARCARIB School would soon become common knowledge throughout South America, and, therefore, it would become a difficult problem to accept students from one country and not accept students from other countries." Moreover, the United States became concerned that the "establishment of intelligence training in the USARCARIB

School would tend to defer the establishment of an intelligence training program within the country concerned." Eisenhower did not object to intelligence training per se. He just did not want rivalries distracting Latin America from their primary mission, hemispheric defense. Latin Americans bitterly resented this favoritism. So, in October 1956, the chief of the U.S. military mission in Brazil received materials for a counterintelligence course with specific directions to ensure the "custody" of same. The army preferred to control the dissemination of such specialty training.[68]

In turn, the military missions and advisors stationed in Latin American nations tried to ignore the school. Instead, the U.S. Army took care to emphasize that the training received by Latin American military personnel proved the effectiveness of the Mutual Defense Assistance Program. While the new Commandant at the USARCARIB School, Colonel George E. Leone, stressed the benefits of the program in August, 1954 when he

---

[68] See RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Administrative Files, 1955-1962, Box 84, FN 353 (1/1/56), [2 of 2], 1-2; Lt. Gen. W. K. Harrison (CGUSARCARIB) to ASD/ISA, letter, 18 May 1956, "Counterintelligence Training for Latin American Nationals (U)," Inclosure, RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Administrative Files, 1955-1962, 1955-1956 Cases, Box 84, FN 353 (1/1/56), [2 of 2], 1; Lt. Gen. W. K. Harrison (CGUSARCARIB) to ASD/ISA, letter, 18 May 1956, "Counterintelligence Training for Latin American Nationals (U)," Inclosure, Col. T. B. Hanford (Reg. Dir. West. Hemi./ASD) to ACOS/G-2 Army, memorandum, 20 Aug. 1956, "Counterintelligence Training for Latin American Nationals," RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Administrative Files, 1955-1962, 1955-1956 Cases, Box 84, FN 353 (1/1/56), [2 of 2], 1; Lewis C. Coleman (Adjutant General) to CGUSARCARIB, letter, 10 July 1956, "Counterintelligence Training Material for Foreign Countries (U)," RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Administrative Files, 1955-1962, 1955-1956 Cases, Box 84, FN 353 (1/1/56), [2 of 2], 1; George H. Roderick (ASA) to ASD/ISA, memorandum, 18 Dec. 1956, "Intelligence Training for Latin American Nationals (U)," RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Administrative Files, 1955-1962, 1955-1956 Cases, Box 84, FN 353 (1/1/56), [2 of 2], 1; Harry O. Paxon (Dep. ACS, Intelligence CONUS) to Chief, USAR/Joint Brazil-U.S. Military Commission (CGUSARCARIB), letter, 17 Oct. 1956, "Training Materials for Foreign Countries (U)," RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Administrative Files, 1955-1962, 1955-1956 Cases, Box 84, FN 353 (1/1/56) [1 of 2], 1-2; and Roderick (ASA) to ASD/ISA, "Intelligence Training," 1. NARA II.

noted that, because of "IRDA and/or MDAP funds . . . these sponsorship students receive without cost to host government their personal maintenance cost and course cost," the MAAGs did not consider the school to be a critical part of their mission. Through procedure and intra-service rivalry, the mission chiefs and the MAAGs as a whole tended to leave the school out of the loop, so to speak, on a regular basis. For example, in 1955, the South and Central American mission chiefs held a conference at Ft. Amador, on the Pacific Coast of the Zone, to discuss their efforts and problems encountered while on tour. But no one from the school, not its commandant nor any of its instructors, were invited. Instead, the MAAGs focused on their many and varied missions to Latin America. The Inter-American Geodetic Survey (IAGS) proved to be one of those programs in which the army set great store, citing its unique ability to unite the peoples of the hemisphere. This topographical mapping project was designed to pave the way, so to speak, for road building to greatly enhance the movement of troops and armored vehicles. Beginning in Venezuela, and working their way down the coast of South America, U.S. Army teams assigned to the IAGS were trumpeted as bringing the benefits of modern life to the poor and backwards denizens of the continent's farthest reaches. Military attachés to Latin America were essential to this project. Mission officers managed, however, to keep tabs on the students they referred to the USARCARIB School and continued to pass on requests made by their host nations for training.[69]

---

[69] George E. Leone (Commandant) to Surgeon General, memorandum, 31 Aug. 1954, RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 52, FN 352 (USARCARIB -- LAS), Binder #2. See Mack to (Mission Chiefs), cable 28 Nov. 1955, "Mission Chiefs Conference -- 11-13 Jan. 1956," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 71,

The USARCARIB School tried to meet Latin American demand for infantry training. The Eisenhower administration, by the mid-1950s, accepted the prospect that military training could foster improved relations and in turn greater cooperation on hemispheric defense activities. The president, however, did not want Latin America distracted from its prescribed duties. Given his disdain for the peoples of the third world, Eisenhower did not believe the Latin American military could do much else. So any changes in the USARCARIB School's protocol had to satisfy the demands of hemispheric defense. The school's commandant believed that infantry training did just that. In mid-December 1953, Colonel Taylor sought to impress upon the Caribbean Command that "Latin American training requirements in the past as well as for FY 1955 reflect a preference for U.S Army career type courses of which only a limited number of quota spaces are available for foreign nationals." To that end, Colonel Taylor requested in mid-1953 that the designation of the existing "'The Officers Leadership Course' . . . be changed to the title designation 'USARCARIB Junior Officers Course'." Latin American students bridled under the assertion that they did not, as yet, possess leadership skills. In

---

FN 337 General, Binder #2. For details of the Conference held 13-16 June 1955, see USARCARIB Mission/MAAG Conference, 13-16 June 1955, Fort Amador, Canal Zone, RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 71, FN 337. See RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 69, FN 330.32 Mission, Binder #1-#2; RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 71, FN 337 Visits, Binder #1-#4; RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 71, FN 350.2, Binder #1-#2; RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 84, FN 333.1 (IG), Binder #1-#6; Jones to CGUSARCARIB, memorandum, 16 Mar. 1953, "Annual General Inspection, FY 1953, Inter-American Geodetic Survey Project, Venezuela," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 29, FN 333.1 Inspector General, Binder #1; RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 85, FN 350.2; and RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 85, FN 337 Visits, Binder #1-#3. NARA II.

addition, the USARCARIB School sought to distinguish courses for junior and senior grade officers. The USARCARIB Command decided to make the change to "Company Grade Officers' Course" to be effective in the "1954 School Catalog." In mid-1954, Venezuela requested "Command and General Staff Course" from the military mission to Caracas. The mission wrote to the commanding general of the Caribbean Command that this training represented "an excellent opportunity to promote U.S. doctrines in the Armed Forces of Venezuela. The host government is exhibiting keen interest in our doctrines and it is believed that this interest should be fostered by this type of operation." The mission needed instructional materials from the USARCARIB School. Later that year, the school hosted a detachment of field grade officers for a special course at Ft. Gulick. In late 1955, the school conducted a broad program of instruction for an entire infantry battalion of the Nicaraguan National Guard. Basic infantry training, it seems, fit within the hemispheric defense posture since the United States hoped that Latin America could supply troops in any war with the Soviet Union.[70]

---

[70] Eddleman to CGUSARCARIB, memorandum, 16 Dec. 1953, "School Quotas for Latin American Students Attending United States Service Schools," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 350.2; Col. Taylor (Commandant) to CGUSARCARIB, 14 Oct. 1953, "Redesignation of the Officers' Leadership and Noncommissioned Officers Leadership Courses," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 352 (USARCARIB), Binder #1; Col. Taylor (Commandant) to CGUSARCARIB, 14 Aug. 1953, "Latin American Regimental Command and Staff Course at the USARCARIB School," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 352 U.S.AR-LAS, 1-3; Koenig to Commandant (Taylor), 4 Nov. 1953, "Redesignation of the Officers' Leadership and Noncommissioned Officers Leadership Courses," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 352 (USARCARIB), Binder #1; Ahee to Commandant CGSC, memorandum, 29 Mar. 1954, "Request for Instructional Material," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 52, FN 352 (CGSC),1-2; Rachko to Chief, U.S. Mission, Venezuela, cable, 1 Oct. 1954, "Venezuelan Officers to Attend Latin American Field Grade Officers Course USARCARIB School," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 52, FN 352 (USARCARIB -- LAS), Binder #2; and Pumpelly, memorandum,

To further facilitate the instruction of Latin American military personnel, the USARCARIB School in 1956 began to conduct all courses in Spanish. This represented the culmination of several years' worth of effort and also demonstrated the extent to which the instruction of Latin American military personnel, and not U.S. Army personnel, had become the primary mission of the school. The USARCARIB School had struggled to fulfill its requirement as a conduit for armed forces instructional facilities in the United States, who insisted that "a good working knowledge of written and spoken English is essential for all students selected to attend United States Army Service Schools." The Command and General Staff College required all prospective students "who do not receive waivers" to pass an "English language test." The USARCARIB School also sought U.S. Army personnel with sufficient Spanish language skills to serve as instructors, as they did in late 1956 when they invited "a team of bilingual officers from the Air Command and Staff College . . . to teach tactical Air Support to the Field Grade Officers' Course at the USARCARIB School 26 thru 29 November 1956." As part of their effort to encourage non-English speaking soldiers to come to Ft. Gulick, the school requested permission to have foreign officers serve as instructors. And many Latin American officers sought to extend their tours at Ft. Gulick. In May 1955, the Commandant wrote to the Mission Chief in Bogotá to facilitate the processing for one such student. Col. John J. Davis "requested that the proper agency of the Colombian Ministry of Defense be contacted as to the feasibility of assigning Captain Jorge Robledo

---

10 Nov. 1955, "MAAG memorandum of Record," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 85, FN 333.1 (IG), Binder #4. NARA II.

P. to the USARCARIB School as an instructor in the Infantry Weapons and Tactics Course for a one (1) year period." Colonel Davis did so because he believed that "the assignment of Captain Robledo will greatly enhance the quality of instruction in the Infantry Weapons and Tactics Course and further will provide the school with the Latin American concept of higher level Infantry and Weapons and Tactics function." By the end of the year, the school had its own translation staff. This department has translated U.S. Army training manuals into Spanish for the last four decades.[71]

The USARCARIB School continued to struggle to secure quality Latin American military personnel. To ensure that the school received only those students "who can absorb the instruction and at the same time benefit from the course being given," the 1959 course catalog admonished that "students selected for attendance at the USARCARIB School should be carefully screened by Military Mission Chiefs, Army MAAG Representatives, and Military Attachés . . . to determine his fitness, bearing in mind the scope of the course and the educational prerequisites." The catalog noted that, "in some instances in the past, students from different countries have arrived to take the

---

[71] USARSA, "U.S. Army School of the Americas," Military Review, 89; Shugart to Chiefs, Missions, and USARCARIB, memorandum, 22 Oct. 1953, "Attendance of LA Students to Service Schools in the United States," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 31, FN 352, U.S.AR-LAS, 1; Gavin to MAAGs, Missions, and Attachés (Latin America), memorandum, 4 Nov. 1954, "English Language Tests for Latin American Nominees to CGSC," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 51, FN 350.2, Binder #2; Rowan to Commander Maxwell AFB, memorandum, 10 Oct. 1956, "Request for Guest Speakers," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 85, FN 350.001; Sullivan to Chief, Mission Ecuador, memorandum, 27 Dec. 1956, "Instructor Personnel," Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 85, FN 35216; RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 71, FN 35216; and John J. Davis (Commandant) to Chief of Mission, Colombia, 9 May 1955, "Instructor Personnel," RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 71, FN 35216. NARA II.

same course but have ranged from officers who were graduate engineers to enlisted men who had difficulty reading and writing." Since the paramount mission of the school remained to "contribute to the development of mutual comprehension and goodwill among the military establishments of the American Republics," the school argued that this "can best be accomplished if selected personnel are trained."[72]

By the end of the 1950s, the USARCARIB School had established itself as the U.S. Army's primary center for instruction of Latin American officers. Gone were the courses in heavy equipment operation. Now, the school operated primarily as an infantry-training center, with a range of courses in tactics, from cadet to command and general staff level. While the school did provide instruction for non-commissioned officers, the emphasis clearly shifted to officer training, as demonstrated by such classes as "Advanced and Basic Field Artillery Officers," "Communications Officers," and "Engineer Officers." Among the more consistently popular courses were those on military police with classes for both officers and enlisted personnel. And the USARCARIB School continued some instruction in "cooking," so that the students would be fed, but listed the course under the "Quartermaster Section Staff."[73]

---

[72] USARCARIB School, The USARCARIB School Catalog, 1958-1959 (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1958), vi and 8. John Amos Library, Ridgeway Hall, Ft. Benning, Georgia. [Hereafter cited as John B. Amos Library].

[73] Ibid., 11-66, 67-80, 81-88, 89-93, 121-8, 137-42, and 148.

## TRAINING AND COOPERATION

In the years after World War II, the U.S. Army cemented its belief that it could effect substantive positive relations with the nations of Latin America through the training of selected members of the region's armed forces. Still, hemispheric defense remained the policy of the United States, and the nations and militaries of Latin America were expected to play a decidedly subordinate position. Despite the best efforts of the army commanders headquartered in Panama, the U.S. Army continued its ad hoc tradition of training Latin American military personnel. The level of importance attached to that training grew somewhat with the heightened tensions of the cold war. But with the Canal secure, policymakers simply had more important regions of the world with which to concern themselves. That relative indifference demonstrated itself in the fitful and inconsistent military training of Latin American armed forces that left the U.S. Army Caribbean School mired in bureaucratic squabbles and competing with the more independent and recognized military missions. While the school did manage to shift its orientation to infantry and officer training, dropping heavy equipment courses in 1955, the overarching rubric of hemispheric defense still defined the relatively minor place of Latin American military training in U.S. military policy. That is, until a former pitching prospect did the seemingly unthinkable, and led the overthrow of one of the more persistent authoritarian regimes in Latin America on New Year's Day, 1959.

# Chapter 2:

## Eisenhower and the "P-factor": Psychological Warfare, Paternalism, and U.S. Counterinsurgency Training in Latin America, 1959-1961

President Dwight David Eisenhower's decision at the end of his tenure in the White House to institute counterinsurgency training for Latin America's military represented a qualitative shift in his Latin American policy. Eisenhower felt keenly that the United States had a responsibility to provide leadership during the cold war. Despite the often inflated rhetoric and strident hyperbole of Eisenhower's long-time secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, the president himself focused on what he considered the true threat to the American way of life: nuclear war. True, the president recognized the strategic importance of the Panama Canal and the shipping lanes of the Caribbean, not to mention the region's proximity to the southern United States. But Latin America simply did not merit the attention, let alone cost and effort, of his administration. Consequently, Eisenhower assured himself of loyal and staunchly anti-Communist allies and kept his eyes on the true hot spots of the cold war – Eastern Europe and Asia. Even Vice President Richard Nixon's ill-fated trip to South America in mid-1958, which presaged the great potential for unrest in this previously secure cold war backwater, did not sway America's unswerving support for virulently anti-Communistic dictatorships. The Cuban Revolution in 1959 proved to be a watershed in U.S.-Latin American relations. In short order, the president and his staff would acknowledge that hemispheric defense against massive external attack no longer served as a legitimate defensive posture. They feared

Cuba's potential, as a symbol and through the efforts of its new revolutionary government, to foment insurrection in the region. Internal security in Latin America, therefore, needed to be maintained – with U.S. direction.[74]

President Eisenhower's fiscal conservatism prevented his wholesale adoption of substantial American financial aid as a palliative to Communist aggression in underdeveloped areas. The National Security Council in February 1959 advised the president that "influential segments of Latin opinion equate the attainment of an economy less dependent on the U.S. market and on operations of large U.S. corporations with the achievement of full sovereignty." For his brother, Milton Eisenhower, the answer lay in American financial aid to promote precisely this type of economic independence. The president did share his aides' growing conviction that economic development represented a viable method of staving off Communist advancement in Latin America and elsewhere in the underdeveloped world. Eisenhower came to realize in his own April 1960 visit to South America that economic development had not progressed there and that the region's unrelenting poverty deserved to be alleviated, if only to prevent political instability and Communist subversion, which had become a very real threat with the Cuban Revolution.

---

[74] The contemporary use of the term "counterinsurgency" grew out of "small-unit warfare" military tactics and had imbued with it, by the Kennedy Administration, doctrinal notions of protecting economic development from Communist incursion or subversion. In the parlance of the times, "counterinsurgency," "counter guerilla," "irregular warfare," and "small-unit warfare" were used interchangeably and by the end of the 1950s had become consonant with "internal security." See David F. Schmitz, Thank God They're on Our Side: The United States and Right-Wing Dictatorships, 1921-1965 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 178-233; Stephen Rabe, Eisenhower and Latin America: The Foreign Policy of Anti-Communism (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 26-41; and Mark T. Gilderhaus, The Second Century: U.S.-Latin American Relations since 1889 (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2000), 113-162.

One historian has argued that Eisenhower's shifting Latin American policy late in his tenure prefigured Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress," and had Eisenhower continued to serve as president, his later policy would have greatly mirrored that of his much younger successor. Instead, the Latin American policy of Herbert Hoover offers the more relevant parallel. Hoover had decided that decades of vaguely defined, indefinite military intervention in the Caribbean and Central America should come to a close. But Hoover did not envision the Good Neighbor Policy of Franklin Roosevelt; nor did he, like Eisenhower who came later, wish to expend American tax dollars unnecessarily on peoples who should be prepared to do for themselves. While Eisenhower's notion of acceptable federal government involvement dwarfed that of his Republican predecessor, he, too, emphasized individual attainment and limited federal government interference. Eisenhower did increase aid to Latin America by 850 million dollars in the final two years of his administration. And he did, ultimately, give approval to the Inter-American Development Bank. But that assistance was contingent upon his requirements that American generosity not become a dole for the region's nations. The president's brand of liberalism circumscribed the cost of a dramatically expanded role for U.S. aid to the region.[75]

---

[75] National Security Council, memorandum, NSC 5902/1, 16 Feb. 1959, "U.S. Policy Toward Latin America," White House Office, Spec. Asst. National Security Agency, 1952-61, NSC, Policy Papers, Box 26, FN NSC 5902-Latin America (1), 58. Dwight David Eisenhower Presidential Library, Abilene, Kansas. [Hereafter cited as Eisenhower Presidential Library]. See Robert Griffith, "Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Corporate Commonwealth," American Historical Review vol 87. no. 1 (Feb. 1992), 87-122; Rabe, Eisenhower in Latin America, 140-52. See Alexander De Conde, Hoover's Latin-American Policy (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961). Burton I. Kaufman, Trade and Aid: Eisenhower's Foreign Economic Policy, 1953-1961 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982); Diane B. Kunz,

Instead, Eisenhower's decision to launch U.S. military-directed counterinsurgency training reflected his consistent effort to win the ideological battle with the Soviet Union. In trying to preserve the American way of life, Eisenhower consciously framed the struggle with the Soviet Union as "psychological warfare." The term "psychological warfare" possesses remarkable plasticity and specifically denotes a branch of counterinsurgency tactics, such aspropaganda, civic action, and state police action. Recent scholarship on the Eisenhower Administration suggests that the president "saw psychological warfare considerations as inseparable from other elements of national security." Moreover, this "ideological competition . . . for the allegiance of the world's peoples suffused all U.S. actions and policies." Eisenhower's paternalistic view of non-Europeans, however, impeded his ability to gain a psychological edge in this struggle. He saw "Mexicans as 'rascals at heart. You can't trust them'." Indians were "'funny people'" and he "was convinced that Arabs 'simply cannot understand our ideas of human freedom and dignity'." And Eisenhower was not alone in his disdain for Latin Americans. His blustering secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, remarked in 1953 about Latin Americans that "'you have to pat them on the head and make them think that you are fond of them'." Thomas Mann, the assistant secretary of state for economic affairs under Eisenhower and a long-time Latin American specialist, baldly declared: "'I know my Latinos. They understand only two things – a buck in the pocket and a kick in the ass.'" Few Americans of the day viewed the peoples of the Third World with any sense

---

Butter and Guns: America's Cold War Economic Diplomacy (New York: The Free Press, 1997), 61-7; and Rabe, Eisenhower in Latin America, 140-52.

of racial, political, or cultural equality. But for Eisenhower, according to one historian, "distrust of the abilities of other people came instinctively." He doubted that non-whites could govern themselves and as such could easily fall prey to the blandishments of the Communists. Paternalism so suffused Eisenhower's foreign policy that he relegated to the non-white peoples of the world the "duty to act as 'a model for the necessary cooperation among free people'."[76]

**INTERNAL SECURITY DEBATE**

Eisenhower gave to Latin America a limited and specific duty during the cold war that he believed suited their abilities and purpose. The president embraced hemispheric defense as the most cost-effective way to develop a policy that included the entire Western Hemisphere. And as President Eisenhower sought to prepare his own country for war, his efforts included Latin America as well. In the United States, Eisenhower reorganized the administration of the presidency, importing the military staff system to coordinate policy and action. He instituted the Operations Control Board as a clearinghouse for evaluating and implementing policy. Eisenhower cajoled Congress to fund the Interstate Act in 1956 to revolutionize the nation's physical infrastructure. The massive road program even required that bridges on the new "freeways" had to be constructed to a minimum height to allow for military vehicles to pass underneath. Eisenhower needed to prepare Latin America for war, too, and hemispheric defense did

[76] Kenneth A. Osgood, "Form before Substance: Eisenhower's Commitment to Psychological Warfare and Negotiations with the Enemy," Diplomatic History vol. 24 no. 3 (Sum. 2000), 405-33. See, especially n. 3, p 406; and in Schmitz, Thank God They're on Our Side, 182.

just that. The threat of war made securing the Panama Canal and the shipping lanes of the Caribbean paramount. So, the United States assigned that responsibility to the U.S. Army Caribbean Command, and not to any of the other nations in the region. The United States also wanted to build radar and other surveillance installations and, in the case of Brazil, sites for short-range nuclear missile batteries. In the meantime, the United States had two requirements for Latin America: coast watching and no Communist governments. Military training served hemispheric defense doctrine well because it provided the Latin American military with U.S. expertise and established the framework for coordination in the event of war. And when war came, the United States expected Latin America to follow orders. Eisenhower carefully limited the training the United States provided to Latin America because he would not spend money for programs that the region did not warrant.[77]

The United States recognized the political value of military assistance. The training of Latin American military during the 1950s and 1960s fell under the aegis of what was generically referred to as the Military Assistance Program (MAP). The United States adopted a new role as supplier and trainer to the free nations of the world with the passage of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act in October 1949. While in general the new program reflected America's growing commitment to containment, specifically the Mutual Defense Act allowed the United States to fund training for nations in the newly-formed North Atlantic Treaty Organization. While Latin America rated a several

---

[77] Kunz, Butter and Guns, 63; and Sonny B. Davis, A Brotherhood of Arms: Brazil-United States Military Relations, 1845-1977 (Niwot, CO: University Press of Colorado, 1996), 148-58.

paragraph mention in President Harry Truman's message about the program to Congress several weeks before passage of the act, the region received less than one-half of one percent of the actual funding. In 1951, Congress passed the Mutual Security Act, which allowed the United States military to arrange bilateral agreements with Latin American nations for arms sales and U.S. military training. The funding was nominal – only sixty-two million the first year for the entire region – and Congress restricted American efforts to those that supported Latin America's limited role in hemispheric defense. In reality, the program served as a conduit for World War II surplus that totaled only 317 million dollars by 1958, and between 1950 and 1973 Latin America received "about two percent of all U.S. military assistance and about four percent of all U.S. military sales." But military aid from the United States had a vastly disproportionate impact on the nations of the region, especially in the 1950s and 1960s. Given how small the military budgets were for these nations – the poorer Andean and Central American countries in particular – U.S. aid could represent as much as a "fifty to ninety percent" increase in operating expenditures. MAP aid, therefore, offered enormous political capital for the local leaders who managed to control its dispensation. And given that Latin American military were (and still are), "labor intensive" operations, the sale of even seemingly minimal amounts of arms by the United States could then be dispensed with significant, often considerable, political value accruing to specific officers. In other words, the opportunities for patronage were considerable.[78]

---

[78] See Chester J. Pach, Jr., Arming the Free World: The Origins of the United States Military Assistance Program (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 198-199 for discussion of

The threat of growing political instability in Latin America, however, led the United States to consider increasing internal security support by the late 1950s. American reassessment of the practice of training of the Latin American military began the year before Castro's revolution. Increasing concern about the stability of the region led elements within the defense establishment to see a new purpose for the Military Assistance Program. Growing Soviet efforts in Asia and the Middle East led Eisenhower in May 1957 to push for an "overhaul" of the military assistance posture of the United States. But it was Richard Nixon's May 1958 goodwill trip to Latin America that brought the region under renewed scrutiny. The vice president faced widespread popular opposition in his stops in Argentina, Peru, and Venezuela, culminating in the dramatic moments in Caracas where crowds surrounded and rocked his and the other cars of his motorcade. The treatment accorded the vice president of the United States "jolted" the Eisenhower administration and led the president to reconsider the supposed stability of the region. Although CIA chief Allen Dulles could find no evidence of Communist direction of the protests and attacks on the vice president, Eisenhower and his staff blamed the Communists anyway. In reality, the vociferous and nearly deadly reaction to

---

containment, NATO, and MAP. See Table 1 in Pach, Arming the Free World, 208; John Child, Unequal Alliance: The Inter-American Military System, 1938-1978 (Boulder: Westview, 1980), 121; and Edwin Lieuwen, Arms and Politics in Latin America, rev. ed. (New York: Praeger, 1961), 198-202. In Lieuwen, Arms and Politics, 126; and Timothy P. Wickham-Crowley, Guerrillas & Revolution in Latin America: A Comparison of Insurgents and Regimes since 1956 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 69. For a detailed analysis of quantity, cost, and financial impact of U.S. military aid and sales, see Wickham-Crowley, Guerrillas & Revolution in Latin America, 68-77; Brian Loveman, For La Patria: Politics and the Armed Forces in Latin America (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1999), 152; Brian Loveman and Thomas M. Davies, Jr., eds., The Politics of Antipolitics: The Military in Latin America, 2d rev. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 9; and Lieuwen, Arms and Politics, 175-298; and in Wickham-Crowley, Guerrillas & Revolution in Latin America, 69-70.

Richard Nixon reflected deep-seated "economic grievances," in particular due to the refusal of the United States to include Latin America in the Marshall Plan in 1948 and the perception that the United States sought to deny the region post-war prosperity. Elements within the defense establishment, therefore, sought to use MAP funding to increase internal security capabilities in Latin America.[79]

Existing Mutual Security and Mutual Defense legislation, however, deliberately limited the scope of U.S. military aid. Congress sought primarily to limit the cost to American taxpayers and preclude overt U.S. support of dictatorships. In light of the reaction to Nixon's trip, and the continuing desire to upgrade the entire Mutual Security System, Eisenhower's staff pushed Congress to permit MAP funding "to include a 'modest program . . . primarily for the purpose of internal security'." Congress disagreed. Senator Wayne Morse from Oregon, the Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee for the American Republics, convinced Congress to deliberately limit the scope and details of American military assistance. The 1958 Mutual Security Act stated, categorically, that "henceforth . . . internal security requirements will simply not be taken into consideration in carrying on the military assistance program in Latin America." Congress had a legitimate concern. The Latin America military had a long and very public habit of inserting themselves into the political affairs of their respective

---

[79] Chester J. Pach and Elmo Richardson, The Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower, rev. ed. (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1991), 165. For analysis of the vice president's ill-fated trip, see J. Lloyd Mecham, The United States and Inter-American Security (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961), 341-4; Kaufman, Trade and Aid, 144-5; and Pach and Richardson, Eisenhower, 189. For the roots of Latin American resentment, see Frederico Gil, Latin America-United States Relations (San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1971), 217-9; and Mecham, Interamerican-Security, 346-50.

countries. The military as an institution in Latin America firmly believed they held a scared duty to protect their country, their "fatherland," from the depredations of corrupt politicians and international Communism. And they routinely viewed repression as an effective tool for maintaining the internal security they viewed as essential to good order. That is why Senator Morse had for years fought to prevent U.S. military aid from being used for internal security purposes in other countries. Eisenhower, however, was more concerned with preventing Communism than protecting democracy. And he needed evidence to persuade Congress to allow him greater flexibility with military training. In late 1958, Eisenhower called together another of his blue-ribbon panels to overcome Congress's reluctance to fund greater internal security. The president battled with Congress over the budget, and over the cost and details of the Military Assistance Program in particular. He wanted the Draper Committee, popularly known for its chair General William H. Draper, to evaluate the merits of the Military Assistance Program aid. Given the events of 1958, Latin America now had a prominent place in the Draper Committee's deliberations.[80]

The Draper Committee stressed the ability of MAP training to facilitate hemispheric military "orientation." The committee noted what it termed the "non-

---

[80] Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs Under Mutual Security Act 1960, Foreign Assistance Acts 1961-1965, Parts I-IV, RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy File, 1964-66, Box 2413 FN POL 23 LA 9/11/65, iv; Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Mutual Security Act of 1958, 86th Cong., 2d Sess., p. 12, cited in Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs, 7, n. 4; Frederick Nunn, The Time of the Generals: Latin American Professional Militarism in World Perspective (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992); Loveman, La Patria; Lieuwen, Arms and Politics, 49-100; Loveman and Davies, eds., Politics of Antipolitics, 89-162; Rabe, Eisenhower and Latin America, 147-54; Pach and Richardson, Eisenhower, 167-9; Mecham, Inter-American Security, 338-9; and Kaufman, Trade and Aid, 147-52.

military by-products" of MAP training. MAP training provided new skills to Latin American military, such as "engineering, communications, electronics, medicine, transportation, aviation, administration, finance, and supply." These would be especially useful to individuals when they "returned to civilian life" and would greatly assist the economic development process. Here, the committee stressed the cost-benefits of such training, whether in the U.S. or abroad, led by mobile training teams and missions. Politically, the Draper Committee would only go so far as to mention how, on an individual basis, U.S. armed forces personnel could transmit "people-to-people" the values and traditions of the United States that would lead to an "orientation in consonance with the objectives of U.S. policy." The Draper Committee did warn about the threat of "mirror imaging" in one of the "classified studies" they conducted. U.S. armed services personnel ran the risk of repeating their own training with their Latin American military students and creating "models of our armed forces abroad." Such a practice led to a duplication of effort and cost. The Draper Committee, however, argued that, "especially in underdeveloped countries," the provision of highly technical and skilled training that served minimal functional use to the militaries in question far outweighed their cost. MAP provided trainees a "familiarization with our system," not to mention the "ability to operate MAP-furnished equipment." But "above all," the committee concluded, MAP training developed "leadership . . . unanimously considered to be the most productive achievement of U.S. assistance." And since Latin American nations in particular had "requested" U.S. military missions to help them "re-pattern their armed forces along U.S. lines," the committee's report concluded that this represented a

"desired import." The Military Assistance Program promoted hemispheric defense, trained Latin American military how to use U.S. equipment, and developed military leaders who could work within the military doctrine of the United States.[81]

Critics of the Military Assistance Program still attacked United States' support of undemocratic regimes. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee drafted a letter to the Draper Committee that explicitly addressed the potential for the "serious distortion" of U.S. military aid, an "overemphasis" of which has "unavoidably . . . contributed to the maintenance in power of regimes which have lacked broad support." Such a posture "has helped to create abroad a militaristic image of the United States which is a distortion of our national character." Furthermore, the Foreign Relations Committee worried that an overweening emphasis on military aid "by its very nature tends to create and then to perpetuate military hierarchies which even in the most well developed countries may endanger the very values of individual freedom which we seek to safeguard." This was not a new concern. In late July 1957, the Operations Coordinating Board received a memorandum concerning U.S. internal security activities in Honduras and El Salvador. The OCB was informed that any effort by the United States to supplement its assistance to these nations with police or internal security assistance was inadvisable, "since its tendency would be to identify the United States Government with the regime's repression

---

[81] L.E. Harrison, 28 Oct. 1958, "Non-Military By-Products of the Military Assistance Training Program," Draper Comm., Box 20 U.S. Views re Arab Develop. . . . Some Observations, FN Non-Military By-Products of Military Assistance Training Program, 5; and President's Committee to Study the Military Assistance Program, Classified Study No. 4, 20 June 1959, "Mirror Imaging," Draper Comm. Box 11 Mirror Imaging – Review of Missile . . ., FN Mirror Imaging, Attachment, 15. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

of a non-communist opposition, especially in Honduras." And while "all agencies, especially State and CIA, are extremely concerned with the rate of increase of Communist activities in these countries . . . it is increasingly doubtful that OISP program could be a major solution in itself." In late 1958, President Eisenhower directed the Draper Committee to consider the effect of the Military Assistance Program in forging the image of the United States as a militaristic foe of democracy, and the "relative emphasis which should be given military and economic programs." Eisenhower's secretary of state concluded that anti-American sentiment was overdrawn. In a letter to General Draper, Acting Secretary of State Christian Herter argued that while the United States did indeed suffer an image problem, anti-American sentiment stemmed from local considerations in various countries that generally had little to do with the Mutual Security Program. Instead, the cooperation practiced under MAP enhanced democracy because it served to bolster the long-term security of program countries.[82]

Eisenhower's staff firmly believed that promoting democracy at the expense of anti-Communism foolishly threatened hemispheric security. Senior staff dismissed the position that the United States should look to replicate its experience around the world. "It is impracticable for the U.S. to attempt to mold political institutions in our image,"

---

[82] Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to President, letter, 25 Aug. 1958, "Military Assistance Program," in W. A. Ellis, memorandum, 8 Apr. 1958, "Balance between Military and Economic Assistance," Draper Comm. Box 24, FN Category VII – Staff Files – Relative Emphasis, 1; R. P. Crenshaw to Dearborn, memorandum, 29 July 1957, "U.S. Internal Security Activities in Honduras and El Salvador," White House Office, Spec. Asst. National Security Affairs, 1952-61, Operations Coordinating Board, Subject, Box 3, FN Latin America, 1-2; and President to General Draper, 24 Nov. 1958, in W. A. Ellis, memorandum, 8 Apr. 1958, "Balance between Military and Economic Assistance," Draper Comm. Box 24, FN Category VII – Staff Files – Relative Emphasis, 1, Hand-Written Comments. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

one Draper Committee official wrote to the President, since "many under-developed countries are hardly nations in any real sense." Furthermore, "power is apt to gravitate to the army, the only institution with both force and discipline." It was incumbent upon the United States, therefore, "to develop enlightened leadership . . . which can control the army, ensure public order, and stimulate the growth of representative political institutions." Without American military assistance, the armed forces of less-developed nations would be forced to divert much-needed monies in order to arm themselves. "Such independent efforts," it was argued, "would involve a degree of economic dislocation or even chaos which would make it even more likely that irresponsible political groups, within and without the armed forces, would come into power." Finally, in late October 1958, the former deputy assistant to the director of security affairs for the International Cooperation Administration offered a stirring rebuttal to opponents of the Military Assistance Program. Albert Haney argued passionately that "there could be no greater absurdity than to suggest that the U.S. should support only those countries in the non-Communist world that are truly governed by the consent of the majority." Haney wrote that "confronted as we are against a deadly enemy who is highly disciplined and highly organized . . . the U.S. cannot afford the moral luxury of helping only those regimes in the free world that meet our ideals of self-government." He added pointedly in his cover letter that "in my opinion, the passing of time only serves to reinforce the validity" of his convictions.[83]

---

[83] A. Ellis (Draper Comm.) to the President, memorandum, 8 Apr. 1958, "Balance between Military and Economic Assistance," Draper Comm. Box 24, FN Category VII – Staff Files – Relative

Instead, the Draper Committee contended that the Military Assistance Program represented an excellent opportunity to improve the limited capacity of Latin American military forces to combat subversion. The Foreign Policy Research Institute argued that since the Latin American military offered so little in the way of "tangible military assets to the Western defense system," the United States needed to "decide upon realistic and necessary force objectives." And since the failure in Korea, Communists had reverted to "more subtle tactics of penetration – infiltration, guerilla warfare, and internal coup." Communists increasingly promoted the "ideology of anti-imperialism and promise far-reaching social reform" as part of their effort to "neutralize U.S. efforts to realize the region's full strategic potential." The powerful call of Communist slogans played upon "longheld preconceptions" of the United States as the progenitor of imperialism and inequality and inflamed "anti-Yanquismo." The critical challenge to the United States at this time was to prevent the "transplantation of guerilla movements to Latin American soil." Consequently, "free nations in the underdeveloped world should be persuaded to create, with American help, specialized corps of countersubversive units" to stymie Communist efforts to sow insurrection. The trained members of these units should be deployed in a wide variety of government and educational agencies to "carry on political

---

Emphasis, 4; Albert Haney to Col. Joseph Coffey, memorandum, 20 Oct. 1958, Enclosure, T. K. Maughorn (Assistant Director, Security Affairs) to Arthur L. Richards (Operations Coordinator, OCB), OISP Paper, ARH, 21 June 1957, "Overseas Internal Security Program – Observations and Suggestions by A.. R. Haney," Attachment, Albert Haney, memorandum, 14 June 1957, "Observations and Suggestions Concerning the 'Overseas Internal Security Program' (OISP)," White House Office, Spec. Asst. NSA, 1952-61, OCB, Subject, Box 5, FN Overseas Internal Security, 9; and Albert Haney to Col. Joseph Coffey, 20 Oct. 1958, memorandum, White House Office, Spec. Asst. NSA, 1952-61, OCB, Subject, Box 5, FN Overseas Internal Security, 1. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

warfare." Keeping troops in the field would permit "armies [to] become more familiar with the terrain in which they may someday have to carry out counter-guerilla operations." Additionally, programs such as road building would assist the military with their Indian populations, "which will not remain an inert force forever." Military "civic action" could reduce the revolution of rising expectations in the countryside. This "political warfare" also had the additional benefit of limiting the opportunity for military men to "meddle in governmental affairs."[84]

President Eisenhower was not ready to push for internal security training in 1958. The United States faced a difficult political challenge when it suggested giving Latin America's military greater capabilities to repress dissent in their countries. MAP legislation specifically prohibited explicit internal security training by the United States. The final Draper Committee Report toned down its language by concentrating on the ability of underdeveloped nations to mount internal security campaigns on their own after modernization improvements were made via MAP training. But policymakers still had to face the reality of the domestic political role played by Latin American military. "The prime responsibility of their armed forces, <u>today as always</u>, is not to guard against an alien aggressor but to insure domestic order . . . [and] to furnish a prop either for the constitution or for the incumbent regime." Hence, U.S. military aid possessed

[84] Foreign Policy Research Institute for Institute for Defense Analyses, 8 Apr. 1959, "A Study of U.S. Military Assistance Programs in the Underdeveloped Areas (Final Report Supplement)," Draper Comm., Box 12 Study of U.S. Military Assistance – Final Report Supplement, FN Study of U.S. Military Assistance Programs in the Underdeveloped Areas – Final Report Supplement (1), 62, 64, 68-9, 75, and 77. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

inextricable political pitfalls. If the U.S. assisted a regime, that equated with imperialism; but if it did not, then "it will be accused of reneging on international obligations." The Foreign Policy Research Institute echoed a commonly held administration opinion when it noted in April 1959 that since "at any given time in this century, about half of the Latin American republics were ruled by military leaders," often for decades, and "military coups, most of them bloodless, have occurred for a long time at a fairly regular rate," the United States must consider the ramifications of assisting those regimes. But, in keeping with the thrust of U.S. military policy for the region, it concurred that the United States also must take care to avoid policies that "may cause misgivings in the minds of Latin American army generals and turn them against the idea of hemispheric defense." And hemispheric defense required the absence of Communist governments in Latin America. Consequently, toward the end of the 1950s internal security had become for the United States the underlying priority for Latin American governments. Growing social and political instability in the region threatened that internal security. Eisenhower, therefore, looked for ways to enhance the ability of Latin Americans to keep Communists out. In most cases, the military did that job best. So Eisenhower looked for ways to help the Latin American military do their job. While some of his staff and the Draper Committee pushed to make internal security training the priority in the Military Assistance Program, Eisenhower was not ready to launch a counterinsurgency campaign for all of Latin America. Moreover, the lack of a demonstrable external threat did not permit the White

House to openly promote internal security training, certainly not at U.S. direction. Fidel Castro changed all that.[85]

**"DAMN PUNKS"**

The Cuban Revolution accelerated the reevaluation of U.S. military policy toward Latin America. Fidel Castro's successful overthrow of Fulgencio Batista altered the locus of power in the Caribbean and the hemisphere. Clearly, the United States dominated the hemisphere politically, economically, and militarily. But the United States now had a homegrown challenger in the battle for "psychological" supremacy in the region. Eisenhower and his administration closely monitored the evolving situation in Cuba. Castro and the revolution's intellectual voice, Ernesto "Ché" Guevara, publicly attacked the remaining dictatorships in the Caribbean and in Central America, promoting the Cuban experience as the beginning of a new wave of liberty in the region. In addition to the rhetorical battle, U.S. intelligence believed Ché Guevara had actually tried to land forces on the island of Hispanola. Haiti and the Dominican Republic were two of Guevara's targets. The publication of Ché Guevara's manual for guerrilla warfare in 1960 convinced President Eisenhower that the Cuba Revolution represented nothing less than a Soviet gambit. Guevara's hemispheric call to arms brazenly confronted U.S. hegemony. To the United States, Guerrilla Warfare was nothing less than a declaration

[85] Ibid., 72, 74-5.

of war.[86] By mid-1960 Eisenhower was sure that Castro would have to acknowledge his Soviet masters. That day did not come until May 1, 1961. In the meantime, the Cuban Revolution did not change U.S. policy toward these anti-democratic regimes. The Eisenhower administration, for its part, would not condemn U.S. support of anti-Communist dictators of the Caribbean, Central and South America. And despite the political capital that Fidel and Ché gained by attacking these U.S.-backed strongmen, the United States made no move to oust them or even to attempt to get them to moderate their behavior. Instead, Eisenhower focused on controlling the debate. If the president could not convince Latin Americans that Castro was simply another style of caudillo, then perhaps he could persuade Americans at home. President Eisenhower and his advisors needed to devise the means to contain Castro in the hemisphere.

The United States formally began its reassessment of Latin American policy in February 1959. The National Security Council met on February 12, 1959, to discuss how the United States could enhance its training of the armed forces of the region in order to combat the growing potential of Cuban subversion. President Eisenhower wanted the Defense Department to be sure "to provide special inducements to Latin American officers to study at our U.S. service Academies and training centers." Debating the recently completed NSC staff position prepared for Latin American policy, NSC 5902/1, Eisenhower further ordered his national security team to "see the several U.S. Military Services . . . pay for everything except board and transportation of the Latin American

---

[86] Ché Guevara, Guerrilla Warfare, eds. Brian Loveman and Thomas M. Davies, Jr. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985), ix.

personnel." The president also dismissed his brother's insistence that no military aid be offered to military dictatorships in the region. Agreeing with the assessment of his staff that such a policy "would create serious problems world wide," Eisenhower "commented that . . . the policy statement should at least contain a word of caution" in order to satisfy "American domestic opinion." NSC 5902/1 acknowledged the necessity of promoting internal security in the region but without "U.S. association with local public safety measures which adopt extra-legal and repressive measures repugnant to a free society." The primary thrust of military training by the United States was to bring the Latin American armed services in line with "hemispheric military operations in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans." The new foundation of U.S. policy in Latin America did push for training in order to "foster close military relations with the Latin American armed forces in order to increase their understanding of, and orientation toward, U.S. objectives and policies." While the United States expected military training would "promote democratic concepts and foster pro-American sentiments," as well as contribute to "the defense of the hemisphere by insuring its internal security," the NSC wanted Latin America to engage in mapping expeditions, provide support units for oversees conflict, "if necessary without reimbursement," and ensure that supply purchases fit U.S. protocols and hemispheric demands. The Cuban Revolution led Eisenhower to push his administration for better internal security training options. Latin America's subordinate role, however, had not changed.[87]

---

[87] 396th Meeting of the NSC, 12 Feb. 1959, "U.S. Policy Toward Latin America," Eisenhower Papers, 1953-61, National Security Council, Box 11, FN 396th Meeting of the NSC Feb. 12, 1959, 9, 11;

The United States needed to strike a balance in its quest to prevent Cuban-sponsored Communist subversion in Latin America. Eisenhower had to avoid the appearance of buttressing regional dictatorships. Policymakers saw little potential external threat to the region in light of the Cuban Revolution. In the Special National Intelligence Estimate (SNIE) dated 10 March 1959, the collective view of the CIA, State, Army, Navy, Air Force and Joint Chiefs intelligence operations focused on the limited external threat to existing hemispheric facilities. Instead, the SNIE explored the likelihood of Latin American nations raising the fees they charged for American use of their territory, noting that in "virtually all cases the U.S. is likely to be confronted with significant pressure for increased economic benefits and other modifications of existing arrangements." In noting the "selected U.S. military facilities" of concern in Panama, the authors listed the headquarters of the U.S. Caribbean Command at Fort Amador, the Albrook, France, and Howard Air Force Bases, the Naval degaussing station, and the radio stations of Farfan, Galeta Island, and Summit; they did not list the U.S. Army Caribbean School on the Caribbean side of Panama at Fort Gulick. The June 30 SNIE, however, emphasized the worsening political situation with Cuba and the potential threat that the Cuban Revolution might be exported to Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua, the nations the authors recognized as those most consistently associated with dictatorship. They discussed the growing influence of Ernesto "Ché" Guevara in advancing "Communist interests," and expressed concern about his role in promoting

---

and National Security Council, NSC 5902/1, "U.S. Policy Toward Latin America," 17, 24, and 26-7. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

insurrection against authoritarian rule elsewhere in the Caribbean. The SNIE openly acknowledged the lack of democratic governance in the region, characterizing the ruling power of Panama as an "oligarchy." It further cited the crucial importance of American aid to Duvalier in Haiti, "which averted economic collapse" thanks to the loan of a "marine training detachment." The intelligence report described the Somoza family rule in Nicaragua as a product of "its firm hold on the country's only armed force (the National Guard) and the administration's National Liberal Party," while it referred to the challenges faced in the Dominican Republic because of the "30-year-old Trujillo dictatorship." The anti-democratic history of those dictators left them vulnerable to character attacks as it made them targets of subversion.[88]

The United States, therefore, worried about the public relations battle brewing with Cuba. Eisenhower's administration needed to improve the image of the United States. Allen Dulles was convinced by early 1959 that Cuban-inspired Communist activities would so injure the image of the U.S. in Latin America that war would become a possibility. The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency felt that Castro was the prime threat to the United States and at best a pawn of Communism. In the latter half of March 1959, Dulles provided the acting secretary of state, Christian Herter, a briefing on the "political situation in the Caribbean area." He sought to apprise the secretary of the

---

[88] Special National Intelligence Estimate, SNIE 100-3-59, Washington, 10 March 1959, "Threats to the Stability of the U.S. Military Facilities Position in the Caribbean Area and in Brazil," Item #111, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960, vol. V, The American Republics (Washington: GPO, 1991), 362, 370-1; and Special National Intelligence Estimate, SNIE 80-59, Washington, 30 June 1959, "The Situation in the Caribbean through 1959," Item #122, FRUS, 1958-1960, vol. V, American Republics, 393-406.

threat posed by Cuba in promoting the aims of international Communism in the region. He wrote that, "the present movement, centered in the Caribbean area, against the remaining Latin American dictators is threatened with domination by international Communism, depending on several [unspecified] contingencies, may develop into an anti-American third force." "The United States Government," he went on to warn, "would find itself associated firmly in the public mind of Latin America with the extreme right, especially as the friend and supporter of the Dominican dictator Trujillo." Dulles blamed "the present unsettled situation" on Fidel Castro who, it seemed, sought to promote a "neutralistic bloc in Latin America, while actually supporting Communist dominated revolutionary groups conspiring against the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua." Dulles feared that Cuban inspired revolution would precipitate a regional war that would necessitate OAS intervention. And given that "such a war would be heavily clouded by ideological feelings and slogans, the United States, as the strongest member of the OAS, could very easily acquire an ideological stigma difficult to avoid." The stigma that Dulles sought to avoid: "the United States is the supporter of dictators in Latin America." Thusly tarred, the United States would find itself in "a situation which abets the cause of those who want to bring the Caribbean political situation under Communist domination."[89]

---

[89] Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (Dulles) to the Acting Secretary of State (Herter), memorandum, [Mid- or late March 1959], "The Political Situation in the Caribbean Area," Item #112, FRUS, 1958-1960, vol. V, American Republics, 372-3. See Thomas G. Paterson, Contesting Castro: The United States an the Triumph of the Cuban Revolution (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Richard E. Welch, Jr., Response to Revolution: The United States and the Cuban Revolution, 1959-1961 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983); and Jorge I. Dominguez, Cuba: Order and

The Eisenhower administration then concerned itself with the psychological ramifications of the Cuban coup. The State Department followed up with a directive in early April 1959. The twenty diplomatic missions in the region (as well as missions in Germany, England, Belgium, Spain, Norway, Canada, Italy, Sweden, the Netherlands, Turkey, the Philippines, South Vietnam, Taiwan, and Japan), were informed that the "Department is deeply concerned" at the "danger of armed flareups in [the] region . . . and [the] opportunities these activities give for infiltration and possible heavy gains by communist elements." The circular told its missions that the department was "exploring every means possible of ameliorating tensions," including an intense study of the impact of increased arms shipments, U.S. policy on the "dictatorship issue," as well as the "rising current of feeling against military buildups in Latin America in favor of [an] emphasis on economic development." The State Department notified its missions of a halt in military sales "except where existing commitments cannot be escaped or where there are other well-based and clear considerations of United States interest." Missions could expect that only such things as "spare parts for civil aircraft" would receive approval for shipment, "in view of [the] tense conditions" in the region. For some in the State Department, the "dictatorship issue" remained in the category of those artificially induced concerns rather than a real policy problem. At a meeting of the mission Chiefs of the Caribbean in April 1959, the United States Ambassador to Venezuela, Edward Sparks, delivered a paper that stressed the likelihood that international Communism

---

Revolution (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1978). Dulles to Herter, "Political Situation," Item #112, FRUS, 1958-1960, vol. V, American Republics, 372-3.

would "capitalize on . . . economic, political, and social dislocations in the area and from the growing anti-Americanism of the region," which the ambassador characterized as "basically a reaction by the 'have-nots' against the biggest 'have' nation in the world." The Chiefs collectively focused their "discussion" on the "various irritants in U.S.-Latin American relations and the manner in which they were used and blown up by the Communists." Finally, the gentlemen agreed that Latin Americans simply did not comprehend "United States economic policies," which had the "adverse psychological effect" of fostering "the feeling in Latin America that the United States had rejected policies which were not adapted to their needs."[90]

Eisenhower wanted to retain flexibility to meet the changing threat level in the hemisphere. The United States needed to be aware of the danger of "rising aspirations . . . for more rapid progress toward higher living standards, for more rapid industrialization, for governments more responsive to the popular will and for greater civil liberties." Still, the United States could not permit this sentiment to be used as a pretext for "neutrality in the form of a desire to be disengaged from the cold war." The NSC argued in February that the United States needed to counter the Latin tendency "to believe that the United States overemphasizes Communism as a threat to the Western Hemisphere." Promoting "private investment" amidst a climate of little "respect" for

---

[90] Department of State to Certain Diplomatic Missions, circular telegram, Washington, 3 April 1959, Item #116, FRUS, 1958-1960, vol. V, American Republics, 379; and Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs (Rubottom) to the Secretary of State [Herter], memorandum, Washington, 24 April 1959, "Caribbean Chiefs of Mission Meeting, 1959, Attachment, "Meeting of the United States Chiefs of Mission in the Caribbean Area, San Salvador, April 9-12, 1959," Item #118, FRUS, 1958-1960, vol. V, American Republics, 385.

"contract and property rights" also represented one of the recurring priorities for the United States with the new policy statement, NSC 5902/1. Additionally, the United States needed to be aware that while "Latin America generally credits the United States with maintaining its policy of non-intervention in the political sphere, influential segments of Latin opinion equate the attainment of an economy less dependent on the U.S. market and on operations of large U.S. corporations with the achievement of full sovereignty." Milton Eisenhower cautioned the members of the National Security Council that Latin America's conviction that the United States deliberately stymied economic independence rested on the United States' historical precedent of military intervention in the region. Eisenhower felt his brother's admonitions to the contrary "resulted from an excess of caution." The president wanted official policy to leave the United States the freedom to act regardless of the non-intervention principles enclosed in the Río Treaty of 1947, to which the United States was a signatory.[91]

Allan Dulles flatly rejected any overtures to what he considered to be a dangerous group of spoiled children. For CIA Director Dulles, the inferior nature of the people of Latin America magnified the threat of Communist subversion in the region. He offered a bleak assessment of the lasting impact of the Cuban Revolution in his briefing to the president in mid-February 1959 at the 396th meeting of the National Security Council. Cuba, Dulles put forth, offered the "most worrisome" problem for the United States. He stated that "we were threatened with a partial breakdown in the machinery of

[91] National Security Council, NSC 5902/1, "U.S. Policy Toward Latin America," 57-9; and 396th Meeting of the NSC, "U.S. Policy Toward Latin America," 2. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

government." It seems the "thoroughness" of the Cuban Revolution had left the island nation "very few trained government personnel." More important, to Dulles, the new leader's vainglory threatened regional disruption. "Castro considers himself the man on horseback, destined not only to liberate Cuba but to liberate all the other dictatorships in Latin America," Dulles went on. The "new Cuban officials," however, "had to be treated more or less like children. They had to be led rather than rebuffed. If they were rebuffed, like children, they could do anything." With his brother Dr. Milton Eisenhower present at the meeting, the president temporized and remarked that "we flatter ourselves that we are more sophisticated than our Latin American neighbors." The CIA Director's unintentional irony continued in late June of 1959 when he delivered to the 411th National Security Council meeting a report which listed the efforts of Castro to "repeat in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua the success of his own movement in Cuba which began with very small forces." The ability of the OAS to interdict these efforts and "maintain the peace," he noted, was "somewhat hampered" due to the "general unpopularity throughout Latin America" of these "dictatorships," a "situation," Dulles added, that "would be funny if it were not so serious." Dulles considered the Cuban political attack of the region's dictators as a threat to regional security.[92]

Cuba emerged during the course of 1959 as a major threat to regional security. The growing weight of evidence against Cuba as a subversive threat led the Policy

---

[92] 396th Meeting of the NSC, "U.S. Policy Toward Latin America," 6. Eisenhower Presidential Library; ibid., 11; and S. Everett Gleason, memorandum, 411th Meeting of the NSC, 25 June 1959, "Significant World Developments Affecting U.S. Security," Item #121, FRUS, 1958-1960, vol. V, American Republics, 392.

Planning Staff to propose a reevaluation of America's hemispheric defense posture by the end of that year. On January 28, 1960, Gerard C. Smith, the assistant secretary of state for policy planning, submitted to the secretary of state a lengthy paper that called for "A New Concept for Hemispheric Defense and Development." Smith and Roy Rubottom, the assistant secretary of state for the American republics, wrote in their cover letter that "long range developments and immediate circumstances compel an urgent and thorough re-examination and reorientation of our military and defense policy toward Latin America." Essentially, these State Department policymakers called for "assessing in an integrated fashion the military's contribution to both defense and development." Specifically, the Policy Planning Staff, headed by Henry Ramsay, argued that "the U.S. should undertake (a) to phase out programs in which Latin American forces are unrealistically associated in continental defense roles and (b) to influence Latin American military leaders towards greater emphasis on . . . internal development." The Policy Planning Staff based its reassessment on the premise that "there is no credible extra-hemispheric threat to Latin America to which Latin American military establishments could appropriately respond." Consequently, the militaries of the region needed to focus on "intra-hemispheric defense." The battle against Communism had come to the Western Hemisphere and Latin America had to do its part.[93]

---

[93] Child, Unequal Alliance, 147, originally cited this document as the cornerstone for counterinsurgency policy under John F. Kennedy, placing the date for this document as 15 January 1961. And while "A New Concept for Hemispheric Defense and Development" does outline many of the basic components of what would become the Kennedy administration's revamped U.S.-Latin American military policy, the document was initially drafted on 16 November 1959 and submitted on 18 Jan. 1960, see Roy Rubottom (A/ARA) and Gerard C. Smith (A/PPS) to the Secretary of State, memorandum, 28 January

The U.S. military, however, was not ready for a wholesale change to the hemispheric defense policy. Staffers in the Eisenhower administration argued that Cuba was not the primary threat to regional security. The true "threat" to Latin America came from "Communist-nationalist exploitation of failure to make socio-economic progress." Hence, "the US should start the process of convincing the Latin American military – however long it may take – that their most patriotic role, and their true defense role, lies in executing a concept of defense through development, with all that this entails." "Admittedly," the Policy Planning Staff wrote, "it will be difficult to persuade the older, more reactionary officer groups . . . [who] will not readily drop their accoutrements of prestige or political pretensions." Education, such as that through the proposed Inter-American Defense College and via MAP training, offered an opportunity to influence the next generation of officer corps. And since "no government can remain in power in a majority of the Latin American countries without the support or sufferance of the military," the United States needed to "maintain a friendly attitude on the part of the Latin American military . . . pending the emergence of stronger civilian institutions which can hold the military in control." The Joint Chiefs of Staff, however, rejected the suggestion that the United States should abandon its hemispheric defense policy. On

---

1960, "Re-examination of Basic Concepts on Which Our Military and Defense Policy Toward Latin America Is Based," Tab B, [Henry Ramsey (PPS)], Paper, 18 Jan. 1960, "A New Concept for Hemispheric Defense and Development," Item #30, FRUS, 1958-60, vol. V, American Republics, 178, n. 5. See also McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 157, who cites Child, Unequal Alliance, 148; Roy Rubottom (A/ARA) and Gerard C. Smith (A/) to the Secretary of State, memorandum, 28 January 1960, "Re-examination of Basic Concepts on Which Our Military and Defense Policy Toward Latin America Is Based," Item #30, FRUS, 1958-60, vol. V, American Republics, 174; Child, Unequal Alliance, 147; and Rubottom (A/ARA) and Smith (A/PPS), "Re-examination of Basic Concepts," Tab B, "A New Concept for Hemispheric Defense and Development," 178 and 181.

February 20, 1960, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs John Irwin penned a terse note to Livingston Merchant, the undersecretary for political affairs, that in light of the Staff's recent annual evaluation of America's efforts – "with particular emphasis on the Caribbean area" – "there is no justification from a military point of view for a change in the U.S. strategic concept for defense of the Western Hemisphere." In response, Merchant replied one month later that for those in the State Department "current developments have tended to strengthen our view that there are compelling political and economic factors" which dictated that a "timely review of our military policy toward Latin America [was] necessary." It was not until July 1960 that the Defense Department begrudgingly offered a shift in policy along the lines suggested by the Policy Planning staff. Hemispheric defense would stay, but the United States needed to promote internal security. For Eisenhower, the Military Assistance Program offered the appropriate vehicle to ensure the internal security necessary for hemispheric defense. But the president still needed congressional authorization. He needed to convince Congress to give him the money.[94]

[94] Rubottom (A/ARA) and Smith (A/PPS), "Re-examination of Basic Concepts," Tab B, "A New Concept for Hemispheric Defense and Development," 180-88; John N. Irwin (ASD/ISA) to Livingston Merchant (U/POL), letter, 20 Feb. 1960, Item #31, FRUS, 1958-60, vol. V, American Republics, 190; Livingston Merchant (U/POL) to John N. Irwin (ASD/ISA), letter, 19 Mar. 1960, Item #32, FRUS, 1958-60, vol. V, American Republics, 191; and J. O. Bell (DC/MSA) to Gerard C. Smith (A/PPS), memorandum, 5 July 1960, "Latin American Policy Paper (NSC 5902/1)," Item #36, FRUS, 1958-60, vol. V, American Republics, 198-208.

## COUNTERING SINO-SOVIET PROPAGANDA

Eisenhower believed that the United States needed to step up its internal security training to counter the Communists' anti-American propaganda drive. The United States worried about the growing volume and variety of Communist propaganda and feared its ability to foment insurrection in the wake of the Cuban Revolution. The Economic Intelligence Committee (EIC) of the National Security Council reported in late August, 1959, that "Sino-Soviet Bloc economic activities in underdeveloped areas of the Free World were intensified" during the first half of 1959. The EIC reported that "trade increased sharply" in 1959 between Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union with "Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay again . . . the main targets." The EIC warned that the "Soviet Bloc stepped up its promotional activities in Latin America" as part of an effort to "exploit the area's continuing economic difficulties." The Central Intelligence Agency characterized increasing Chinese propaganda as representing "a wish to frustrate the policies and weaken the position of the United States in an area of prime security importance" where "political and social condition(s) in a number of Latin American countries appear favorable to advancing the movement." "Along with rising Soviet attention to the area," the CIA reports that increasing Chinese Communist action means that there was "no evidence of rivalry . . . rather they have a common interest in weakening United States influence in Latin America." Should that alliance "rupture," the CIA had no doubt that Latin American Communists "would almost certainly remain loyal to their long-established ties with the Kremlin." The EIC update in late February 1960 reported a greatly enhanced Soviet effort that broadened to include cultural exchanges

that emphasized Soviet "scientific achievements" and a concerted effort to woo Mexico and Brazil, the latter of which experiencing economic difficulties. "Anti-U.S. groups stepped up their attacks on the U.S.," the report advised the National Security Council, with the most "serious" threat coming from "revolutionary Cuba, where the Castro regime came increasingly under Communist influence during the year." They concluded that events "further indicated a growing campaign to increase Soviet influence in Latin America on all fronts – political, economic, and cultural – during the next few years." Once again, the Eisenhower administration emphasized how international Communism could agitate locals to incendiary action by playing upon existing "conditions."[95]

The United States Information Agency feared that the Communist campaign could make inroads on the people of Latin America. In early March 1960, the USIA evaluated international Communism's successes in Latin America during the previous calendar year. In addition to providing numerical counts of increasing membership in the Communist Party in Latin America, details of a growing trade with the "Sino-Soviet bloc," and breakdowns of a rise in travel to Communist countries by residents of the

---

[95] Economic Intelligence Committee, EIC-R14-S7, 28 August 1959, "Economic Intelligence Report: Sino-Soviet Bloc Economic Activities in Underdeveloped Areas, 1 January-30 June 1959," White House Office, Spec. Assistant National Security Agency, 1952-61, National Security Council. Briefing Notes. Box 5 FN Communist Economic Activities in Underdeveloped Countries (1) [1959-60], 8, Summary. Eisenhower Presidential Library. See Cecil Johnson, Communist China and Latin America, 1959-1967 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), for an academic analysis that echoes official sentiment. Central Intelligence Agency: Senior Research Staff on International Communism. 26 February 1960, "Chinese Communism and Latin America," White House Office, Spec. Assistant National Security Agency, 1952-61, National Security Council, Briefing Notes, Box 5, FN [Communist Chinese and Latin America], ii-iii; and Economic Intelligence Committee, EIC-R14-S8, 29 February 1960, "Economic Intelligence Report: Sino-Soviet Bloc Economic Activities in Underdeveloped Areas, 1 July-31 December 1959--Summary," White House Office, Spec. Assistant, National Security Agency, 1952-61, National Security Council, Briefing Notes, Box 5, FN Communist Economic Activity in Underdeveloped Countries (2) [1959-60], 7-8. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

nations south of the border, the authors stressed the increased numbers of "front organizations" as the preferred "propaganda device," along with an aggressive use of the media as "outlets for the distribution of Communist publications." "Perhaps the most significant change for the better from the Communist point of view," the authors lamented, "was the growing belief of many Latin Americans that despite the political, social, cultural and religious differences between their countries and those of the Sino-Soviet bloc, the former might profit from increased contacts with the latter." By no means did the USIA feel that Communism had won over the region, but rather that a "'bits and pieces' acceptance of certain aspects or features of Communism and its techniques" was growing, due in large part to "Soviet economic and scientific achievements." The USIA also warned of the "marked rise in Chinese Communist propaganda" involving "all Peiping's various media directed at the area." "Despite the pronounced increase in Soviet prestige," they noted, "local Communist parties, except in a few countries, failed to make significant gains." These "modest gains" included a bifurcated assault on U.S. policy. Official Soviet propaganda concentrated on promoting the cultural achievements of that Communist land, "stressing the accomplishments and virtues of its system and the benevolence of its intentions." "Local Communist propaganda," however, "blamed the U.S. for all that was wrong with Latin American countries." Not surprisingly, "in no place was the anti-U.S. theme so vigorously pursued as in Cuba," with every misfortune that country experienced perceived to be the product of insidious U.S. imperialism. The USIA reported that many of Communism's claims came under fire by the mainstream press in the region. Still, the propaganda arm of the

United States during the cold war added, "such an all-inclusive doubt and denigration on the part of Communist propagandists may have appeared ridiculous to the more thoughtful it probably had an impact on the vast mass of uneducated in the area."[96]

Communist front organizations also threatened to sway the unwary in the Western Hemisphere. General Edward Lansdale weighed in before the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) in late June 1960 on the latest of various nefarious "collateral activities" of Communism. The foremost architect of military counterinsurgency doctrine, Lansdale declared to the nation's military leaders that the Communists "have given a top priority to reducing and discrediting the Free World military power and prestige." The nuclear "deterrent" of the United States had forced the Communists "to take the long way to world conquest." "We must understand the enemy," Lansdale warned, "if we are to be effective in countering his propaganda and terror operations aimed to undermine vital military assets." In particular, the general sought to update the Joint Chiefs on the Communist "use and support of 'fronts'" used to exploit "groups which ostensibly represent important elements of the nation's population . . . such as laborers, the youth, the students, the teachers, the women's groups, and the professional class." Lansdale stressed the "complete subservience to" and "financial dependence on Moscow" of these fronts, which enforced the dire "lack of democratic control." "Each," he warned, "is controlled by a dedicated Communist receiving instruction from Moscow, and Communists under

[96] United States Information Agency, R-13-60, 3 Mar. 1960, "Communist Propaganda Activities in Latin America, 1959," Sprague Comm., Box 3, FN LA #12 (3), [Cover, Highlights, i-vii, Table]. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

discipline and training run these fronts from headquarters to the field." "The Communists," Lansdale went on to say, "exploit the character of local popular support" while claiming to be "'fighting for peace.'" Cuba presented a case in point, since "help for Castro fit the Communist purpose of undermining the US deterrent to Communist aggression and the furthering of Soviet world conquest." While Lansdale acknowledged that the United States could not find "Communist fingerprints" on these fronts, he had no trouble directly attributing the current "'hate America'" campaign to "operatives inside the Castro movement." Lansdale certainly was not above a little colorful hyperbole when he admonished the JCS, "I trust that you will not discover that you were busy tying a shoe lace while our enemy was swinging one at you from the floor, with brass knuckles."[97]

Eisenhower still had to contend with a Congress reluctant to provide military aid for internal security. His administration had begun to position itself by early 1960 for more comprehensive measures to combat the growing threat of Communism in the hemisphere. The president sent his acting secretary of state to Congress to argue for an expanded use of MAP to combat Communism in our hemisphere. Christian A. Herter reminded the House Foreign Affairs Committee in mid-February 1960 that "it is an undeniable fact that the Communist masters . . . are unrelenting in their advocacy of their beliefs" with a conviction of the "irresistibility of their power and the inevitableness of

---

[97] Brigadier General Edward G. Lansdale to Joint Chiefs of Staff, Lecture, 29 June 1960, "JCS Seminar on Collateral Activities: Communist Operations," Sprague Comm., Box 8, FN #28 Military (15), 1-6. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

their victory." To combat this "powerful, crusading and dedicated force," the United States must use its resources to bolster the "economic strength" of less developed nations, since "we long since recognized as well that military defenses are not enough to thwart the spread of Communist control." Furthermore, the United States must combat the Sino-Soviet thrust into our hemisphere with even more resources, more money. In order to "defend our way of life . . . to help others to defend themselves, to achieve progress," America must ensure the "preservation of an adequate defensive strength" along with "encouragement and promotion of human betterment." Herter promoted military training as crucial to this vision of mutual security, citing its effectiveness in Europe. But he carefully stressed that increased self reliance was the hallmark of any program and that training would weld the interdependence necessary to combat the scourge of Communism. And, he reminded Congress, the United States dare not miss this chance, because "this marginal aid is, of course, of critical importance since it can mean the difference between success or failure."[98]

Eisenhower could not quite overcome Congressional opposition in the spring of 1960. His administration tried to convince Congress that the United States needed to increase its countersubversion efforts in Latin America. By that spring, the Eisenhower administration had begun to shift its stance to one of how best to stymie the rising threat posed by the Cuban Revolution. The Operations Control Board, one of Eisenhower's

---

[98] Christian A. Herter, Mutual Security Steering Group, Memo 16, 16 February 1960, "Statement of the Honorable Christian A. Herter Secretary of State Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, February 17, 1960," Herter Papers, Box 16, FN Mutual Security Program Statement 2/17/60, 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, and 11, Eisenhower Presidential Library.

favorite and most efficient entities, reported in April 1960 that "the past year was marked by intensification of Sino-Soviet bloc efforts to extend its political and economic influence in the area . . . and of the Castro movement to establish neutralist and subversive revolutionary Latin American organizations and activities." And the growing security risk in Latin America was placed squarely at the feet of Castro in a memorandum submitted to the National Security Council in early August 1960, entitled, "Responsibility of Cuban Government for Increased International Tensions in the Hemisphere." The growth of the new communist menace led the OCB to question "whether over-all U.S. and Latin American interests are best served by the Hemisphere Defense concept." Congress chose to reinforce that very defense posture when it revised limitations on MAP to Latin America in "Section 105(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1960," which insisted that "military equipment and materials be furnished to the other American Republics only in furtherance of missions directly relating to the common defense of the Western Hemisphere." Eisenhower's dissatisfaction with the legislature's unwillingness to accede to his prescription for hemispheric security did not restrict his administration's creativity. His advisors noted that the 1954 Mutual Security Act had prohibited the "use of appropriations . . . for the dissemination" of propaganda within the United States. And the 1958 Mutual Security Appropriation Act reaffirmed this restriction. Congress, however, had not sought to "limit propaganda activities in foreign countries." Hence, the United States could very well make use of this latitude afforded by lawmakers to expand the "cultural" aspect of the Mutual Security Program. But Congress did provide the president a loophole in 1960. Section 105(b)(4) went on to

decree that "internal security requirements shall not, unless the President determines otherwise, be the basis for military assistance programs to the American Republics." Procedurally, the president would have to investigate a specific internal security threat to a Latin American country and present to Congress his reasons for obviating the legal restriction. Congress, too, had cast a wary eye on events in Cuba after 1959. The representatives and senators collectively accepted containment as the foundation of U.S. foreign policy. Still, they were not ready to give the president free reign just yet. If Eisenhower wanted to expand MAP training to include internal security, he would have to ask for it – on the record.[99]

**SPRAGUE COMMITTEE AND INTERNAL SECURITY TRAINING**

The United States military had for years touted its ability to reach its Latin American counterparts in unique ways. Castro's ability to twist American policy to serve his image as a "Robin Hood" presaged a more hands-on policy toward seemingly nationalist movements in Latin America. In 1960, Eisenhower commissioned the last of his blue ribbon panels, the Sprague Committee, to establish the efficacy of U.S. foreign information activities, such aspropaganda and psychological warfare. The president

---

[99] Bromley Smith (XO/OCB) to James S. Lay, Jr. (Exec. Sec. NSC), 7 Apr. 1960 "OCB Report on Latin America (NSC 5902/1)," White House Office, Spec. Asst., National Security Agency, 1952-61, NSC, Policy Papers, Box 26, FN NSC 5902/1-LA (1), 2; Marion W. Boggs (Acting Exec. Sec. NSC) to NSC, memorandum, 5 Aug. 1960, "U.S. Policy Toward Cuba," White House Office, Spec. Asst. NSA, 1952-61, NSC, Subject, Box 4, Fn Cuba [May 1959-Sept. 1960] (5), 1-78; Smith (XO/OCB) to Lay (Exec. Sec. NSC), "OCB Report on Latin America," 6; Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs, 5; Donald B. MacPhail (Acting DDO/ICA) to Waldemar Nielsen (Exec. Dir. PCIAA), memorandum, 21 April 1960, Attachment, "Statutory Restrictions on Flexibility Relating to the Mutual Security Program," Sprague Committee, Box 5, FN Psychological Aspects of Foreign Aid #19 (4), 5; and Smith (XO/OCB) to Lay (Exec. Sec. NSC), "OCB Report on Latin America," 7, Eisenhower Presidential Library.

looked to the Sprague Committee to provide the considered rationale for making internal security training part of the MAP protocols. The authors of the position paper that became the core of the final report of the President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad (Sprague Committee) wrote in May 1960 that "it will not be enough to 'counter' Communist efforts to capture revolutions like Castro's." Instead, "some formula must be sought which will anticipate and influence developments in ways consistent with constructive inter-American interests." While the authors abdicated responsibility for proposing such a solution, they did insist that United States military training of Latin American personnel afforded "important constructive influences toward" achieving the goals of NSC 5902/1. Specifically, "the U.S. should make a considerably greater effort to identify, establish contact with, encourage and cultivate selected people . . . younger leaders who will develop into positions of greater influence." This required a "skillful effort . . . in the hard to reach area of students, teachers-professors, intellectuals, trade union leaders, young military officers, progressive religious leaders, some of whom are critical of the U.S." Such efforts of necessity "will have to be covert because of the sensitivity of present governments to U.S. government contact with opposition elements, and the sensitivity of such personnel to overt identification with U.S. activities." The Sprague Committee concluded that the rising Communist menace in the Western Hemisphere compelled a new sense of urgency. The threat of Cuban subversion now required the U.S. military to make full use of the very

personal relationships developed by U.S. military trainers with their Latin American students.[100]

The Sprague Committee believed that the Mutual Security Program could enhance American interests abroad by utilizing the "psychological role of the military." The final report concluded that since the U.S. military "finds itself involved in foreign affairs to a much greater degree than ever before in peacetime history," it had become necessary for the United States to enhance its "psychological warfare capability." Outlining the various avenues available to U.S. military to engage in a psychological battle against Communism, Sprague Committee staff noted on April 11, 1960, that the "United States . . . is in a position to exert important influences on the armed forces of Latin America and other developments in the area." They listed the "thousands of Latin American military personnel who have attended schools in the United States" at the academies and command schools, along with the "U.S. Army and Air Force schools at Gulick and Albrook, Panama," in addition to the various MAAGs and military missions to Latin American embassies. The committee echoed a position espoused by the Eisenhower administration for years, that U.S. training provided Latin American military with a concentrated dose of the "American way of life." The Sprague Committee deemed the simple "presence of hundreds of U.S. military personnel and their families" at U.S. training facilities especially efficacious. Consequently, military planners were directed to include, directly within regimens for visiting Latin Americans, "training

[100] President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad, PCIAA No. 12, 23 May 1960, "Latin America," Sprague Committee. Box 21, FN PCIAA No. 12 (1), 6, 13. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

exposition and explanation of some of the dynamics of American society with emphasis on the elements adaptable to the trainee's country." "We should," it was argued, "consider the role the U.S. armed forces play in the information -- psychological impact – influence -- political action area in Latin America—what we call for lack of better shorthand, the 'P-factor'," since all could agree that "it is in the joint interest of the United States and Latin America to prevent Communist penetration of the area and the Communist takeover of the socio-economic revolution taking place there."[101]

The United States needed, therefore, to take advantage of MAP training's currently untapped power to influence "potential leaders" in Latin America. In the midst of rising social unrest and Communist agitation in Latin America, the United States needed a way to reach the power brokers of Latin American society. While mutual security laws prohibited internal security training, those same laws directed U.S. military trainers to develop "close military relations with the Latin American Armed Forces . . . and to promote Democratic concepts and foster pro-American sentiments among Latin American military personnel." "Unfortunately," the hemispheric defense orientation of the United States led MAAG personnel to "limit their activities to providing technical advice and training directly related to the MAP equipment provided." The Sprague Committee argued, however, that the ability of a particular military officer to exert any

[101] Staff Notes, N.d., Sprague Committee, Box 8, FN Military #28 (12), 1 and 4; E. Brown, memorandum, 11 Apr. 1960, "Influence Potential of U.S. Military Activities in Latin America," Sprague Comm., Box 13, FN Committee Reports-2, 1; President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad, Paper, 12/F, [28 July 1960], "Influence on Other Developments in the Area." Sprague Committee. Box 8. FN Military #28 (1), 1; and Brown, "Influence Potential of U.S. Military Activities," 2.

influence was limited only to the initiative of the officer in question. "Theoretically, since they are paid for by the host government, mission personnel are available to provide whatever type of assistance the host government desires." The Sprague Committee suggested that the United States armed forces could circumvent congressional restrictions with appropriate training of MAAG personnel. And properly trained U.S. missions and MAAGs could help to evade the "political and personal favoritism . . . especially for candidates for the more senior schools" that shapes the choice of which Latin American military students come to the United States for training. At home and abroad, the Sprague Committee argued, U.S. officers had the opportunity to both directly, via the "command responsibility at each U.S. school," and indirectly, through their normal activities and actions, influence their Latin American comrades. "Since this is generally recognized as perhaps the greatest single benefit currently being derived from our foreign military training program," the authors also recommended more formal institutionalization to promote this most salutary aspect.[102]

The Sprague Committee also concentrated on the ability of U.S. military personnel to impart a slice of the "American way of life" to Latin Americans. The simple "presence of hundreds of U.S. military personnel and their families" at U.S. training facilities was deemed especially efficacious. Consequently, military planners sought to include, directly into regimens for visiting Latin Americans, "training exposition and explanation of some of the dynamics of American society with emphasis on the elements

---

[102] Annex B, "The Armed Forces and Potential Leaders," Sprague Comm., Box 8, FN Military #28 (3), 1-2. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

adaptable to the trainee's country." And given the region's poverty and "desperate need of skilled and educated people," this was a significant contribution. The authors of the report "Influence on Other Developments in the Area" lamented the overweening emphasis of military planners on hemispheric defense in contravention of Latin American concerns. In late February 1960, the president of Brazil made manifest this concern when he politely inquired of the United States and President Eisenhower as to whether or not the United States, with its vast array of intelligence gathering information, could include Brazil in its deliberation as a gesture of good will designed to improve policy development. In addition, the Brazilian leader wanted to engage the United States in a dialogue with the intent of increasing that country's share of U.S. markets to promote its own economic development. These suggestions and concerns were his way of warning the United States against adopting a strictly East-West orientation toward the regions in the southern hemisphere. "The formation should be avoided, South of the Tropic of Cancer," President Kubitschek wrote, "of an underdeveloped area of the world, within which problems common to underdeveloped countries would tend to create an instinctive solidarity, more powerful than any political combination and fatal to the Western cause." While the president of Brazil noted that his country had no intention of opening relations with Communist China, if other Southern hemisphere nations sought a more neutral line, he believed that the United States should accept it. Eisenhower abhorred precisely this

type of language. But, the Sprague Committee argued, the demands for economic development would lead Latin American politicians to make such concessions.[103]

The Sprague Committee in turn pointed to the stabilizing force exerted by the region's armed forces and the necessity of internal security while economic development progressed. It cited literacy efforts on the part of the military in Brazil, Colombia, Paraguay, Guatemala, and Peru; training programs in "broadcasting, graphic arts, motion pictures, publications, etc."; bridge and road building by the Bolivian military; transportation provided by the Dominican navy; and, in El Salvador, "soldiers may elect to complete 1 year of obligatory service and practical work in agricultural pursuits, such as poultry and bee raising or production of corn, rice, or vegetables." In doing so, the authors of this Sprague Committee draft wholeheartedly endorsed the unpublished Draper Committee findings. Clearly, they sought to draw attention to the need for the United States to adopt those recommendations. The U.S. needed, therefore, to alter its emphasis in MAP training from hemispheric defense to internal security so that, as an OAS ambassador put it, "the armies would cease to be merely reserve forces to be used in the event of an inter-American war, where they would be practically impotent. . . . They would be a supplementary force for the overall realization of economic-development programs, and a training center that would prepare thousands of Latin Americans for the battle of production." The Sprague Committee believed that the concentrated political

---

[103] President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad, 12/F, "Influence on Other Developments in the Area," 2; Juscelino Kubitschek (President of Brazil) to Eisenhower, Aide Memoire, I, 23 Feb. 1960, White House Office, S/Secy, International Trips and Meetings, Box 10, FN DDE South American, Chron., Brazil, Feb. 23-26 (1), 1, 7. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

power of the Latin American military made them the ideal target audience for the United States in the battle against Communism in the hemisphere. Only they could ease their nations through the development process.[104]

The Eisenhower administration by the end of 1960 concluded that internal security represented the best hope for preserving democracy in the hemisphere. Through the 1950s, the Defense Department had held that "all military training provided foreign forces increases their internal security capability and that, therefore, little specific training for this purpose is actually necessary." A new sense of urgency, however, led the Department of Defense to promote "vital" internal security training, "especially in underdeveloped areas" subject to subversion. "Intelligence, psychological operations, unconventional warfare and civil affairs" were portrayed as but part of a "gradual reorientation" of MAP training programs designed to assist the Latin American military to maintain internal security. The Sprague Committee recommended that the Eisenhower administration take advantage of its relationship with the Latin American military to impart internal security training. The "armed forces are a significant political power factor – present or potential – in all countries of Latin America, except Costa Rica." And the United States should exploit the "influences of the armed forces of Latin America, including those persons who may rise to positions of future military and political leadership" as the best option for promoting democracy. The committee challenged the

[104] President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad, 12/F, "Influence on Other Developments in the Area," 6-13. Eisenhower Presidential Library. See ibid., 9-15 for details of many other programs, all touted as beneficent to economic development and led by various nations' military.

"often-heard complaints" that U.S. military aid did nothing more than buttress "undemocratic regimes . . . and contribute to a drain on the economies of these countries."[105] The Office of Special Services in the Defense Department explained:

> The traditional involvement of the military directly and behind the scenes in domestic affairs while shocking in our political context is hardly surprising in the Latin American context. We must remember that our military forces are used principally externally, while Latin America armed forces are by necessity crucially linked in some manner to the maintenance of internal stability. Thus, for larger than purely military reason, we must continue to work with and encourage responsible leadership qualification in Latin American military forces. And the guidance that can be transmitted through military aid activities should be in the broad field of opinions and attitudes as well as in the narrower field of professional military skills. Where indigenous armed services are in the formative stage and traditions are in the process of development, or where attitudes are changing as new officer generations replace the old, both the informal and formal example and teaching of our military personnel, if constructive and in the spirit of freedom and democracy, can have immense psychological impact.[106]

The Latin American military, the committee argued, had served an essential pacifying role, curbing the "violence [that] has been both cause and effect of governmental instability in Latin America." The lack of any institutional framework for the democratic transition of government required that Latin American military men intercede to ensure "conformance with the will of the people and the preservation of democratic concepts and institutions." "The fact of the matter is," Sprague staffers contended, "that in all but

---

[105] Annex B, "Armed Forces and Potential Leaders," 3; Brown, "Influence Potential of U.S. Military Activities," 1; and Brown, "Influence Potential of U.S. Military Activities," Attachment B, "Influence on Other Developments in the Area," Sprague Comm., Box 13, FN Military #28 (3), 1. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

[106] Edward C. Bursk, Jr. (Off. Sp. Ops.), memorandum, 14 Sept. 1960, "Sprague Committee Staff Paper for Comment on 'Latin America'," Sprague Comm., Box 8, FN Military #28 (8), 2, Eisenhower Presidential Library.

a few Latin American countries the army can provide the only effective support to enable a president to finish his term and pass on the reins of government peacefully to the next administration." The Latin American military, it seems, were not just the best option; they were the only option.[107]

## THE EMERGENCE OF COUNTERINSURGENCY POLICY

President Dwight David Eisenhower decided to tackle the threat of Communist subversion in Latin America – on election day, November 8, 1960 – when he issued Executive Order 10893. Here, the president authorized the secretary of state – and not the secretary of defense -- to determine whether the United States should initiate training of Latin American military to promote "internal security" in the region. Just over a week before, at a meeting between senior staff members of the Department of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Thomas Mann, the under secretary of state for economic affairs, "observed" that the training of the Latin American military by the United States not only had provided in the past decade a "bulwark . . . for the preservation of democracy in Latin America" but also had served "to keep the military element, the only stabilizing influence in those areas, on the side of the West." Unfortunately, those present lamented the unwillingness of Congress to sanction military training to "perpetuate the right-wing dictatorships there." But they suggested that "the rise of Castro and all he represents in South America" should produce a "definitely changed attitude in Congress" that could

[107] President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad, 12/F, "Influence on Other Developments," 4. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

mean "much more support for a program of military training and equipment for internal security." Both State and Defense Department officials felt that a "program to increase internal subversion defenses in Latin America must be tailored to the individual country." Colombia was singled out for its need of "increased training . . . to combat large scale guerrilla tactics." The president evidently concurred and sought documentation to enable him to commit the United States to internal security training.[108]

By year's end, the acting secretary of state, Livingston Merchant, offered the president reasoned justification for including military training as part of the Mutual Assistance Program. Colombia received special attention in this first effort on the part of the outgoing president to shore up regional defense against the new scourge of Communist subversion. Merchant argued that "Communist influence reportedly is increasing in the areas infested by bandits, and agents of the Castro Government in Cuba are known to be active among anti-government groups"; thus, "the proposed military assistance is needed to enable the Colombian Government to expand its campaign against organized bandits and guerrillas," thereby promoting the "security of the United States." U.S. advisors and instructors at U.S. military facilities would provide instruction "in such subjects as counter-guerrilla warfare, intelligence, civil affairs, psychological warfare, public and troop information, and criminal investigation." An historical précis on

---

[108] Dwight D. Eisenhower to Secretary of State (Merchant), memorandum, 5 Jan. 1960, "Determinations under Sections 105(b)(4) and 451(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as Amended, Permitting the Furnishing of Military Assistance to Colombia," White House Central File, Confidential, Subject, Box 42, FN Mutual Security Assistance [1961] (1), 1; and Memorandum, 28 Oct. 1960, "Substance of Discussion at the Department of State-Joint Chiefs of Staff Meeting, Pentagon," Item #40, FRUS, 1958-60, vol. V, American Republics, 216-7.

Colombia revealed the rise of banditry since 1946 amidst the continuing political turmoil of bloody internecine Liberal and Conservative Party violence. As a consequence, the country seemed particularly susceptible to Communist subversion sponsored by Cuba. "All of the training is to be given at United States installations in Panama," with the exception of a "mobile training team" to be sent to Ecuador. At the U.S. Army School of the Caribbean, located at Fort Gulick, Canal Zone, the secretary of state's memorandum recommended to the president that courses in riot control, anti-guerrilla warfare, and psychological war be provided at that facility. So advised, President Eisenhower quickly approved the plan. He further instructed the army to begin conducting a counterguerrilla operations and tactics course at Fort Bragg. The counterinsurgency training proposed by the president in the first days of 1961 offered the Latin American military a truly Eisenhower solution: American expertise for self help at a relatively low cost.[109]

---

[109] Livingston Merchant (Acting Sec. of State) to the President, memorandum, 31 Dec. 1960, "Determinations under Sections 105(b)(4) and 451(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as Amended, Permitting the Furnishing of Military Assistance to Colombia," White House Central Files, Confidential, Subject, Box 42, FN Mutual Security Assistance [1961], (1), 1; Livingston Merchant (Acting Sec. of State) to the President, memorandum, 31 Dec. 1960, "Determinations under Sections 105(b)(4) and 451(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as Amended, Permitting the Furnishing of Military Assistance to Colombia," Enclosure 2, "Military Assistance for Colombia Requiring Determinations, Under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as Amended," White House Central Files, Confidential, Subject, Box 42, FN Mutual Security Assistance [1961], (1), [1]; John Bell (DC/MSA) to Secretary of State, memorandum, "Determination under the Third Sentence of Section 105(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as Amended, Permitting Military Internal Security Training Programs for the American Republics," Enclosure A [of D], White House Central Files, Confidential, Subject, Box 42, FN Mutual Security Assistance [1961], (1); John Bell (DC/MSA) to Secretary of State, memorandum, "Determination under the Third Sentence," Enclosure B [of D], "Training Program for Developing the Intelligence and Counter-Intelligence Capabilities of Latin American Countries," White House Central Files, Confidential, Subject, Box 42, FN Mutual Security Assistance [1961], (1); Dwight D. Eisenhower to Secretary of State (Merchant), memorandum, 5 Jan. 1960, "Determinations under Sections 105(b)(4) and 451(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as Amended, Permitting the Furnishing of Military Assistance to Colombia," White House Central File, Confidential. Subject, Box 42, FN Mutual Security Assistance [1961] (1), 1; and Dwight D. Eisenhower, 3 Jan, 1961, "Special Staff Note -- Guerrilla Training," Whitman File, DDE Diary, Box 55, FN Toner Notes -- Jan. 1961, 1. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

# Chapter 3:

## "Barbarians at the Gate":

## Kennedy Combats Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere

John F. Kennedy sought from the very beginning of his administration to change the tenor and tone of U.S. policy toward Latin America. With his inaugural address, President Kennedy promised to the people of Latin America: "We offer a special pledge . . . to convert our good words into good deeds . . . in a new alliance for progress." In this Alliance for Progress, the new president conceived of a grand array of programs and actions designed to modernize the region quickly in order, as he put it, "to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty." And to protect these nascent democracies during this "peaceful revolution of hope" from becoming "the prey of hostile powers," the president declared: "Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas." With massive economic and military aid, and broad infrastructure improvements, Latin America was to become a petri dish for a new policy designed to combat the spread of Communism in the world's underdeveloped regions. The grandeur and scope of the project tapped into a deep well of American idealism and helped to foster a missionary zeal for programs such as the Peace Corps, designed to carry out the good works of this new Alliance.[110]

---

[110] John F. Kennedy, inaugural address, 20 Jan. 1961, http://www.umb/jfklibrary/j012061; Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman, All You Need Is Love: The Peace Corps and the Spirit of the 1960s (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).

President Kennedy launched the Alliance for Progress on March 13, 1961. In a speech given at a White House Reception for Latin American diplomats, he announced that "the genius of our scientists" had left the hemisphere poised "to strike off the remaining bonds of poverty and ignorance." To succeed "at this moment of maximum opportunity," however, the Americas must be prepared to battle "the alien forces which once again seek to impose the despotisms of the old world on the people of the new." And the new president made clear the relative position of Latin America in this fight when he characterized those nations in his inaugural address as "our sister republics south of our border." He cemented the preeminence of the United States in inter-American affairs when he concluded his section on the Americas with the dictum "let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house."[111]

Much has been made, then and now, of President Kennedy's desire to successfully counter the Soviet Union in world affairs. In many respects, his insistence to "get tough" with the Russians served as the driving force behind his foreign policy. The example of Munich 1938, used so often to justify American policy initiatives during the cold war, also motivated the young president. Any hint of appeasement of the forces of aggression, he concurred, would only threaten world stability and lead to war. Mao's successful revolution in China in 1949 proved more relevant to the new president. As a

---

[111] John F. Kennedy, address, 13 Mar. 1961, "White House Reception for Latin American Diplomats, Members of Congress, and Their Wives," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Task Force on Latin America, Subject and Country Files, 1961, Box 2, FN The President, 1. NARA II. And see Stephen G. Rabe, The Most Dangerous Area of the World: John F. Kennedy Confronts Communist Revolution in Latin America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 9-10. And John F. Kennedy, inaugural address.

junior Congressman from Massachusetts, Kennedy observed firsthand the domestic political fallout for the Democratic Party – and a Democratic President – when the world's most populous nation "fell" to Communism. Kennedy learned in his first days as a politician the ravages that domestic anti-Communism could wreak on his party and on the careers of American politicians. Communism had to be contained abroad, he believed, to prevent its insidious spread. And, to keep his position at the head of his Party, President had to contain Communism abroad. Hence, Kennedy initially viewed Cuba as a litmus test, not only of his will to serve as president, but also of his political future. That is why he held such high hopes for the clandestine plan to overthrow Castro in the spring of 1961. A quick victory would eliminate the threat of Communism in the hemisphere and demonstrate his gumption to the world and to voters at home. His narrow victory in the election of 1960 made this essential. The Bay of Pigs invasion failed miserably. But the foray did teach the young president the need to better coordinate within his administration. It also left him with the persistent threat of subversion posed by Castro's revolution.[112]

President Kennedy believed Cuba represented a new and dangerous Soviet effort to provoke instability in the underdeveloped nations of the world. Nikita Khrushchev declared to the Soviet leadership only days before Kennedy took office that the future of

---

[112] Peter Wyden, Bay of Pigs: The Untold Story (New York: Touchstone, 1979); Trumbell Higgins, The Perfect Failure: Kennedy, Eisenhower, and the CIA at the Bay of Pigs (New York: Norton, 1987); Richard E. Welch, Response to Revolution:The United States and the Cuban Revolution, 1959-1961 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 64-100; and John Giglio, The Presidency of John F. Kennedy (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1991), 48-63.

Communist expansion lay in helping the colonial peoples of the world in "wars of national liberation." Eisenhower had properly chalked this up to Soviet bluster and intra-Communist wrangling. President Kennedy, instead, viewed this as a personal challenge by the Soviet premier and a real threat to world peace. That is why Kennedy found the ideas of Walt W. Rostow so inviting. Rostow boldly joined a chorus of economists and academics during the late 1950s when he authored his "Non-Communist Manifesto," arguing that the conditions for western-style economic development could be stimulated in the so-called underdeveloped areas of the world with infusions of capital and, especially, expertise. Rostow, though, feared that during the tender and liminal "take-off" stage, when a middle-class and democratic capitalism were fighting to take root, outside forces could disrupt or even stymie the time-elapsed growth process. Hence, he argued that maintaining internal security remained the paramount priority of those nations. According to Rostow, the United States must develop the military techniques necessary to ensure internal stability in underdeveloped regions. For Kennedy, Rostow's ideas gave him the considered rationale for the Alliance for Progress and the tools, in the persons of what would be called the United States Special Forces, to insert himself, forcefully, into Latin America and thereby prevent Cuban subversion. And since the Latin American military already perceived Communism as the greatest threat to order in their societies, they readily agreed with the president and his advisor and sought U.S. aid and training.[113]

---

[113] Rabe, Most Dangerous Area, 20-2; Michael McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft: U.S. Guerrilla Warfare, Counter-Insurgency, and Counterterrorism, 1940-1990 (New York: Pantheon, 1992),

## READYING FOR WAR

The new Kennedy Administration lost little time in wedding counterinsurgency training to the foundation of the new Latin American policy of the United States. On January 30, 1961, just ten days after taking office, National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy argued that "the most urgent need is for a review of basic military policy." Bundy raised what would become the beginnings of Kennedy's "flexible response" posture when he specifically targeted the need to develop "limited war forces" as opposed to the previous emphasis on maintaining "strategic" defense capabilities. In that vein, "the President requested" at the February 1, 1961 meeting of the National Security Council "that the Secretary of Defense . . . examine means for placing more emphasis on the development of counter-guerilla forces." Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara responded to the National Security's "Action Memorandum" Number 2 on February 23, informing Kennedy that his Department had initiated efforts to formulate "a doctrine for improved counter-insurgency operations." McNamara went on to add that he envisioned "the addition of some 3000 men to the Army's Special Forces and a budget augmentation

---

162-3; Michael Beschloss, The Crisis Years: Kennedy and Khrushchev, 1960-1963 (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 60-1; Giglio, John F. Kennedy, 46-7; Walt W. Rostow, The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960). See principally Raúl Prebisch, The Economic Development of Latin America and Its Principle Problems (New York: United Nations, 1950); Gunner Myrdal, Economic Development and Underdeveloped Regions (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1957); Daniel Lerner, The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East (New York: Free Press, 1958); Max Millikin and Walt W. Rostow, A Proposal: Key to an Effective Foreign Policy (New York: Harper, 1957); Walt W. Rostow, "Guerrilla Warfare in Underdeveloped Areas," Marine Corps Gazette, vol. 46 No. 1 (Jan. 1962), 46-9; Brian Loveman, For La Patria: Politics and the Armed Forces in Latin America (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1999), 160-62; and Edwin Lieuwen, Arms and Politics in Latin America, rev. ed. (New York: Praeger, 1961), 282-95; and for a more optimistic assessment, see John J. Johnson, The Military and Society in Latin America (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), 244-67.

of $19 million." The United States needed to develop the military capability, not only to insert itself forcefully into trouble spots around the globe but also to permit the nation's military to train our allies around the world. In the Western Hemisphere, the "most of the repressive, right-wing dictatorships" had given way to "constitutional regimes," a promising start that took place only with the "active participation of the local military or with their tacit consent." To preserve these nascent democracies, the American Republics desk of the State Department argued that the United States urgently needed to furnish "training in internal security techniques to military personnel of all countries, except Cuba and the Dominican Republic." The president himself told Congress in mid-June that the growing threat of Communist subversion in Latin America, and elsewhere in the Third World, mandated a "complete reevaluation of the role of military assistance." Later that June President Kennedy had McGeorge Bundy order the secretary of defense in NSAM 56 "to inventory the paramilitary assets" of the United States as a "first step" toward "our possible future requirements in the field of unconventional warfare and paramilitary operations."[114]

---

[114] McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to President Kennedy, memorandum, 30 Jan. 1961, "Policies Previously Approved in NSC Which Need Review," NSF, NSC Meetings, Box 313, FN #470, 1; NSC, Minutes, "Military Budgets and National Security Policy," in 475th NSC Meeting, 1 February 1961, "Record of Actions," NSF, NSC Meetings, Box 313, FN #470, 4; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to the President, National Security memorandum No. 2, 3 Feb. 1961, "Development of Counter-Guerilla Forces," NSF, NSAM, Box 328, FN NSAM 2, 1. Bundy instituted the "action memoranda" in a deliberate attempt to replace what he viewed as the institutional lethargy of the Eisenhower administration. The new national security advisor abhorred the lengthy process that produced the detailed reports of the National Security Council and sought to, in the spirit of new administration, impose an activist, "can-do" mentality. Ironically, his action memoranda often produced bureaucratic bottlenecks that required later memoranda to clear up; Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, 23 Feb. 1961, "Development of Counter-Guerilla Forces," NSF, NSAM, Box 328, FN NSAM 2, 1. John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, Boston, Massachusetts. [Hereafter cited as Kennedy Presidential Library]; Wymberley DeR. Coerr (ARA) to Dean Rusk (Sec. of State), memorandum, 15 Apr. 1961, "ARA

Cuba's ability to project its revolution into the nations of Latin America represented the primary threat to U.S. national security in the hemisphere for the new president and his staff. Reporting to the president on March 10 on his visit to South America, Arthur Schlesinger rejected any future U.S. support of the hemispheric defense policy and instead argued forcefully that "obviously Communism is aiming to conquer Latin America by penetration and not invasion." General Curtis LeMay worried at a key State Department/JCS briefing on April 28, 1961 that while he doubted that "Cuba per se would ever become a military threat to the United States . . . the big problem . . . was that all of Latin America might go Communist." The State Department in late April 1961 warned that the "transformation of Cuba into a Soviet satellite" represented but the latest phase of "Castro's fondest dream [of] a continent-wide upheaval which would reconstruct all Latin America on the model of Cuba." By May 1961 the State Department declared in a White Paper that "Cuba has already become a base and a staging area for revolutionary activity throughout the continent." In a memorandum on May 1, 1961 to Rostow, now head of the Policy Planning Staff, a senior staff member for the undersecretary for the American republics, Frank Devine, included a report dated

---

Requirements for Mutual Defense Assistance Funds," RG 59, General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Central American and Panamanian Affairs, Subject and Country Files, 1955-1963, Box 3, FN ARA – U.S. Military Assistance Program for Latin America – Internal Security 1961, 1. NARA II; U.S. House, Message from the President of the United States Transmitting the Final Report on the Operations of the Mutual Security Program, House Doc. 432, 87th Cong., 1st Sess., 12 June 1961, 33; and McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, NSAM 56, 28 June 1961, "Evaluation of Paramilitary Requirements," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-1 Natl. Security Council (NSAM Memoranda), 1. NARA II.

August 1, 1960, which contended that "no sooner had the Revolutionary Government of Cuba taken power than it launched a program for exporting its revolution to other countries in the Hemisphere." Castro's regime, Devine warned, "has been organizing, supporting, and encouraging a number of revolutionary leaders and movements" in the region with the sole intent to "undermine and violently overthrow existing national governments" relying on Ché Guevara's "handbook, La Guerra de Guerrillas" as the manual for hemispheric insurrection.[115]

Internal security training, it seemed, offered the best defense against Cuban subversion in the hemisphere. For the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the primary threat from Cuba was its "ability to train guerrillas." Brigadier General Edward Lansdale argued that "it would be more purposeful to concentrate" on developing the counterinsurgency strength of specific "countries with currently critical or potentially critical situations," such as Vietnam and Colombia. Consequently, the State Department's Policy Planning Council focused on internal security in the region as the most salutary curative in a series of detailed papers issued in early June 1961. In the first of these, the PPC directed by Rostow focused on the "new political and juridical bases to defeat Communism." The

---

[115] Arthur Schlesinger (Spec. Asst.) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, 11 Mar. 1961, Enclosure, Arthur Schlesinger (Spec. Asst.) to President Kennedy, memorandum, 10 Mar. 1961, NSF, Reg. Sec. Box 211-6, LA-General, 3/8-3/16/61, 13. Kennedy Presidential Library; Department of State, State-JCS Meeting, 28 Apr. 1961, "Substance of Discussion," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Records of State-JCS Meetings, 1959-1963, Box 2, FN State JCS April 28, 1961, 9. NARA II; Department of State, "Cuba," Inter-American Series 66, April 1961, NSF, Country, Box 35a, FN Cuba, General, White Paper, 5/61, 25. Kennedy Presidential Library; and Frank J. Devine (American Republics) to Walt W. Rostow (Policy Planning Council), memorandum, 1 May 1961, "Contributions for Your Paper on the Rationale," Tab C, Department of State, draft paper, 1 August 1960, "Responsibility of Cuban Government for Increased International Tensions in the Hemisphere," NSF, Country, Box 35a, Cuba, General, State Dept. "Rationale," 5/61, 47-8. Kennedy Presidential Library.

United States should seek, whenever practical, to work within the framework of international law and seek to "bolster legal forms of surveillance, strengthen internal security capabilities, and counter, upon request of the host country, internal uprisings inspired or supported by international Communism." The Council was quick to add that any such operations must perforce include sustained efforts to engage in civic action with the purpose of "eliminating dissidence." In light of this subversive threat, the Policy Planning Council issued another study that used the Chinese example to demonstrate the pattern of popular insurrection used by Communists to achieve their political goals abroad. Rostow unequivocally placed the Cuban Revolution within that history. The Council then followed just days later with a detailed analysis of the crucial role played by the armed forces of developing nations. While debating the use of the term "internal security", and suggesting that perhaps "internal stability, public safety, or constitutional order" might be "more psychologically palatable," Rostow emphasized that "the object is to find a phrase which would embody the positive concepts of deterrence of guerrilla warfare, and of counter-guerrilla operations, and project the thought that, if the right actions are taken during the deterrence stage, a country will be better able to cope with guerrilla rebellion if it occurs." For Rostow, one of the foremost architects of economic development policy in the Kennedy administration, counterinsurgency training became essential to preserving the stability of emerging democracies. And Rostow intended that the United States military would provide the requisite instruction.[116]

---

[116] Department of State, State-JCS Meeting, 28 Apr. 1961, "Substance of Discussion," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Records of State-JCS Meetings, 1959-1963, Box 2, FN State JCS April

So armed, the president directed his administration to intensify the training of Latin American military by the United States in NSAM 88 on September 5, 1961. The president asked for an update on U.S. efforts to "train the Armed Forces of Latin America in controlling mobs, guerrillas, etc." Given that the "military occupy an extremely important strategic position in Latin America," President Kennedy wanted to know "what steps we are taking to increase the intimacy between our armed forces and the military of Latin America." The president concluded that perhaps the FBI could be used to assist in the instruction process. Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric responded to the president that the Defense Department had undertaken a wide range of efforts in the United States and in Latin America and that "during the past two years, increasing emphasis has been placed on training Latin Americans in riot control, counter-guerilla operations and tactics, intelligence and counter-intelligence, public information and psychological warfare." As part of a range of specific examples, the Deputy Secretary noted that at "Ft. Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone, an internal security type course was established in July of this year . . . solely for military students of Latin American

---

28, 1961, 10. NARA II; Brig. Gen. Edward Lansdale (Spec. Asst. Spec. Ops.) to Roswell Gilpatric (Dep. Sec. of Def), memorandum, 19 June, "Counter-Guerrilla Training," NSF, Meetings and Memoranda, Box 326-7, FN Staff Memos, Rostow, Guerrilla Warfare, 6/14/61-6/30/61, 2. Kennedy Presidential Library; George McGhee (U/Pol. Aff.) to Adolf Berle (U/ARA), letter, 9 June 1961, "Approaches Toward New Political and Juridical Bases to Defeat Communism," Attachment, Department of State, Policy Planning Council, 61-1, 9 June 1961, "Approaches Toward New Political and Juridical Bases to Defeat Communism," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Task Force on Latin America, Subject and Country Files, 1961, Box 2, FN National Security Council, 32. NARA II; Department of State, Policy Planning Council, PPC 61-2, 13 June 1961, "Counter Guerilla Operations," NSF, Meetings and Memoranda, Box 3267, FN Staff Memos, Rostow, Guerilla Warfare, 6/1-6/13/61; and Department of State, Policy Planning Council, PPC 61-5, 16 June 1961, "Internal Defense of the Less Developed World," NSF, Subject, Box 303, FN Policy Planning, PPC 61-5, n. *, Table of Contents. Kennedy Presidential Library.

countries and is being conducted in Spanish." Acting Secretary of State Chester Bowles cautioned at the end of September, 1961 that given the "strategic position the military hold in most under-developed countries . . . we can do much to include in our training programs for foreign military personnel a better appreciation of their role as builders, as well as defenders, of the emerging democratic societies."[117]

By early December Kennedy had pushed the Defense Department to formulate a specific overall policy for U.S. counterinsurgency training of the Latin American armed forces. The Joint Chiefs of Staff had provided the president on November 30, 1961 with a detailed proposal for new "military actions for Latin America." JCSM 832-61 called for "congressional action" to reduce the limitations on internal security training and spending and a reorientation from "hemispheric defense only to internal security, anti-submarine warfare, counter-insurgency, and civic action." The Joint Chiefs memorandum also pushed "all US Government representatives in Latin America . . . to stress that the military is an instrument responsive to democratic government and should act in support of the constitutional principles of that government." While the president acknowledged the general principles of JCSM 832-61, he also made it clear in NSAM 118 that he wanted the Department of State and especially the Department of Defense to

---

[117] John F. Kennedy to the Secretary of Defense (Robert McNamara), NSAM 88, 5 Sept. 1961, "Training for Latin American Armed Forces," Item #80, Foreign Relations in the United States, 1961-1963, vol. XII, The American Republics (Washington: GPO, 1996), 180; Roswell Gilpatric (Deputy Sec. for Def.) to the President, memorandum, 11 Sept. 1961, NSF, NSAM, Box 331-2, FN NSAM 88, 1; Department of Defense, memorandum, "Summary of Training for Latin Americans in U.S. Military Schools and Installations," 2, Addendum to Roswell Gilpatric (Dep. Sec. Def.) to the President, memorandum, 11 Sept. 1961, NSF, NSAM, Box 331-2, FN NSAM 88, 1; and Chester Bowles (Acting Sec. of State) to President Kennedy, letter, 30 Sept. 1961, NSF, NSAM, Box 331-2, FN NSAM 88, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library.

provide greater clarity and specificity in their intentions and efforts. In mid-December, McGeorge Bundy further admonished the secretary of state and secretary of defense that "the President is concerned that we may be missing an opportunity this year to develop methods for supporting whatever contribution military forces can make to economic and social development in less-developed countries." Bundy added that "while recognizing that civic action is not universally applicable . . . we must coordinate civic action with other programs directed at the same goals."[118]

Kennedy grew increasingly impatient with the limited improvements made in Latin America's internal security forces as he entered his second year in office. A special team of ranking officers from the State and Defense Departments, along with the CIA that was sent to assess the "internal security situation in South America," returned with a report on January 10, 1962 that warned that, still, "the primary threat to internal security come[s] from the capabilities of Communists and Communist sympathizers" who have demonstrated themselves adept at "discrediting, outflanking, and outmaneuvering" the governmental efforts they have not already co-opted. The Assessment Team added that the depth of the problem meant that "almost all actions" by the United States would

---

[118] McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, memorandum, NSAM 118, 5. Dec. 1961, "Participation of U.S. Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118, 1, Kennedy Presidential Library; L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair, JCS) to President Kennedy, memorandum, JCSM 832-61, "Military Actions for Latin America (U)," Item #89, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 197-8; L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair, JCS) to President Kennedy, memorandum, JCSM 832-61, "Military Actions for Latin America (U)," Appendix A, "Military Actions for Latin America," Item #89, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 199; and McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Secretary of State and Defense, NSAM 119, 18. Dec. 1961, "Participation of U.S. Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 119, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library.

improve internal security and the report went on to highlight a range of needs still unmet. The next day, President Kennedy issued a stern note to Robert McNamara, stating that "I am not satisfied that the Department of Defense, and in particular the army, is according the necessary degree of attention and effort to the threat of Communist-directed subversive insurgency and guerrilla warfare, although it is clear that these constitute a major form of politico-military conflict for which we must carefully prepare." Kennedy chastised the army's effort at some length and specifically directed the Joint Chiefs to add a general officer to direct counterinsurgency training efforts, as well as ordering that all MAAG officers receive training at Ft. Bragg. Two days later, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs sent the update requested in early December by NSAM 118. In JCSM 30-62, General Lemnitzer reaffirmed that the "primary role of the Latin American armed forces in the Southern Hemisphere should be internal security and anti-submarine warfare." He included a comprehensive chart detailing the variety of counterinsurgency training efforts then being conducted, from action by the Defense Department in Congress to raise internal security funding limits, to Mobile Training and Assessment Teams deployed in Central America, and to U.S. Air Force missions to enhance Latin American transportation of internal security forces, along with a whole host of training missions to specific Latin American countries as well as courses taught at a variety of schools in the United States and in Panama. The charts the general provided the president, however, listed activities then underway – most of which had already been reported to the president

– and did not address Kennedy's concerns about a unified counterinsurgency training mechanism, both in and outside the United States.[119]

President Kennedy decided on January 18, 1962, to establish the Special Group Counter Insurgency (CI) to oversee the development of United States counterinsurgency training and capacity. President Eisenhower had formed the Special Group as a body in 1954 to supervise U.S. activities in Guatemala. Called the Special Group 5412, so named after the National Security Council action that authorized its formation, it continued to serve Eisenhower throughout the 1950s on clandestine internal security matters abroad. Kennedy appointed Maj. Gen. Maxwell Taylor to lead this small but very influential group when he took office. Taylor had reportedly left his post as Army Chief of Staff under Eisenhower in part because the president did not share the general's convictions about counterinsurgency forces and also because Taylor openly challenged the defense posture of the United States under Eisenhower. But Taylor did fit the new president's mold and under Kennedy the Special Group 5412 administratively displaced the

---

[119] Washington Assessment Team, Report, 10 Jan. 1962, "Report of the Assessment Team on Internal Security Situation in South America," Item #90, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 203-4; President Kennedy to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, 11 Jan. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 56, FN 370.64 Jan.-July, 1962. 1-2. NARA II; L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair, JCS) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, JCSM 30-62, 13 Jan. 1962, "Participation of US and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America (U)," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118-JCS Proposal, Tab B, Annex A, 3/62, 2; L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair, JCS) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, JCSM 30-62, 13 Jan. 1962, "Participation of US and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America (U)," Annex A to Appendix A, "(Two Charts)," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118-JCS Proposal, Tab B, Annex A, 3/62, [1-2]; and L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair, JCS) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, JCSM 30-62, 13 Jan. 1962, "Participation of US and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America (U)," Annex B to Appendix A, "Programs Underway in support of JCSM 832-61 Prior to Issuance of NSAM 118)," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118-JCS Proposal, Tab B, Annex A, 3/62, [1-3]. Kennedy Presidential Library.

Operations Control Board, one of Eisenhower's preferred administrative organs, which Kennedy's staff had found too cumbersome. On June 28, the same day the president issued NSAM 56, Kennedy in NSAM 57 picked the Special Group to carry out "paramilitary operations" against Cuba in the notorious "Operation Mongoose," a series of clumsy efforts by the CIA that failed to assassinate Fidel Castro. By the beginning of his second year in office, the president's dissatisfaction with the performance of the executive branch led him to formalize supervision of counterinsurgency policy in his administration. And in NSAM 124 President Kennedy established the Special Group (CI) "to assure unity of effort and the use of all available resources with maximum effectiveness in preventing and resisting subversive insurgency and related forms of aggression in friendly countries."[120]

---

[120] Willard Barber and C. Neale Ronning, Internal Security and Military Power: Counterinsurgency and Civic Action in Latin America (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1966), 97. See McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 166-70; and Rabe, Most Dangerous Area, 128, for discussion of the formation of the Special Group and its role in Latin American policy. On U.S. intervention in Guatemala see Richard Immerman, The CIA in Guatemala: The Foreign Policy of Intervention (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982); Stephen Schlesinger and Stephen Kinzer, Bitter Fruit: The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala (New York: Anchor Books, 1982); Piero Gleijeses Shattered Hope: The Guatemala Revolution and the United States, 1944-1954 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); and Ronald Schneider, Communism in Guatemala (New York: Octagon, 1979). National Security Council, paper, NSC 5412, [12] Mar. 1954, "National Security Council Directive on Covert Operations," White House Office, NSA, Box 10, FN NSC 5412. Eisenhower Presidential Library. See also McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 166. On Taylor, Eisenhower, and counterinsurgency, see McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 512, n. 19. For the general's views on the role of the military and U.S. policy, see Maxwell Taylor, The Uncertain Trumpet (New York: Harper, 1960); Barber and Ronning, Internal Security, 94; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst, NSA) to Special Group 5412, memorandum, NSAM 57, 28 June 1961, "Responsibility for Paramilitary Operations," NSF, NSC, memos and minutes, Box 330, FN NSAM 57, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library. Also cited in McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 169. See Fabián Escalante, The Secret War: CIA Covert Operations Against Cuba, 1959-62, trans. Maxine Shaw, ed. Mirta Muñiz (Melbourne: Ocean Press, 1995), 101-13; and Rabe, Most Dangerous Area, 137-42, on Operation Mongoose. President Kennedy to NSC, memorandum, NSAM 124, "Establishment of the Special Group (Counter-Insurgency)," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 124, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library; and quoted in McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 166.

The Special Group (CI) carried significant weight within the Kennedy administration. The members that constituted the Special Group (CI), as well as the importance the president attached to the Group's purpose, assured its influence. General Taylor had emerged as a leading architect of counterinsurgency methods to combat Communism, and the president chose him to head the new incarnation of the Special Group. Taylor believed that a new group was needed not only for the "development of a counter-insurgency program" and the "coordination of departmental tasks" executing U.S. counterinsurgency policy, but also to assure the "timely identification of a problem area" that would facilitate the appropriate "implementation" of American counterinsurgency forces and training. While McGeorge Bundy drafted the initial memorandum calling for a reformulation of the Special Group, details emerged out of an evaluation of the Bay of Pigs disaster conducted by Richard Bissell. The Group was initially comprised of Taylor, as the chair, along with the Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, the Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs U. Alexis Johnson, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Lemnitzer, the new CIA Director John McCone, the National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy, and Fowler Hamilton, the administrator of the Agency for International Development. Robert Kennedy rounded out the initial complement and proved to be perhaps the most important member of the Special Group. The attorney general shared – or at least openly supported -- his brother's conviction of the necessity of confronting Communism in this manner and fought to

instill the president's sense of urgency into his administration. Robert Kennedy also reported directly to the president immediately following each weekly meeting.[121]

General Taylor and the Special Group (CI) focused on developing specific training regimens to provide the tools modernizing militaries needed to keep their underdeveloped nations secure from Communist subversion. A growing chorus of experts inside and outside the administration openly viewed the Latin American military as the key to preserving stability in that region. On February 5, 1962, the State Department came on board. The Executive Secretary of the Department of State, Lucius D. Battle, offered his department's response to NSAM 118, which rejected Hemispheric Defense as a viable policy and instead promoted the development of the Latin American military as the essential bulwark against Castro-sponsored subversion. Furthermore, Battle argued that amidst the destabilizing process of the Alliance for Progress, the United States needed to secure the favor of a "rising generation of younger officers sympathetic to social and economic reform." The key, according to Battle in a "revised report" issued at the very end of February, was making sure that "U.S. military programs . . . acquaint the Latin American military with the complete portfolio of communist

---

[121] Maxwell Taylor (Chair, Special Group 5412) to President Kennedy, memorandum, 2 Jan. 1962, "Establishment of the Special Group (Counter-Insurgency)," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAMM 124, 1; Maxwell Taylor (Chair, Special Group 5412) to President Kennedy, memorandum, 2 Jan. 1962, "Establishment of the Special Group (Counter-Insurgency)," Inclosure, McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Special Group 5412, memorandum, Draft NSAM, "Establishment of Special Group (Counter-Insurgency)," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 124, 1-3; Robert W. Komer (Spec. Asst. Intelligence) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), letter, 31 Jan. 1962, NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 124, 1; President Kennedy to NSC, memorandum, NSAM 124, "Establishment of the Special Group (Counter-Insurgency)," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 124, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library; and see Roswell Gilpatric's comments in McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 167.

techniques, including the communist tactic of alienating the military from the support of the civilian population by depicting them as a repressive, extravagant and irresponsible element of public life." The State Department echoed the Draper and Sprague Committee staffers when Battle contended that it would be "particularly desirable" that the United States adapt training regimens and promote conferences and the like, "which bring U.S. and Latin American military personnel into close professional and personal association." And to make sure that the United States kept control of the entire process, Battle concluded that "it is essential" that Latin American nations receive only those programs that "would serve U.S. foreign policy interests." He went on to caution that Defense and State personnel be strictly instructed to dissuade Latin Americans from requesting any programs "prior to a careful determination" rendered by the State Department. Simply put, Battle said do not give Latin America what they want; give them what America knows they need. Kennedy concurred and on March 26, 1963 the president "approved the Department of State's policy guidance statement of February 28" and absolved the State Department of any further responsibility under NSAM 118.[122]

---

[122] For discussion, see Rabe, Most Dangerous Area, 128; L. D. Battle (Exec. Sec. OSS) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, 5 Feb. 1962, "National Security Action memorandum No. 118 – Participation of U.S. and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118 – State/Defense Report, 2/62, 2-3. Kennedy Presidential Library. Also cited in Rabe, Most Dangerous Area, 129. McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, NSAM 140, 26 Mar. 1962, "Participation of U.S. and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America," RG 286, Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-1 Natl. Security Council (NSAM Memoranda), 1. NARA II.

The military establishment, however, continued to disappoint President Kennedy. as they sought to impose their own counterinsurgency training doctrine. General Lemnitzer responded to the president's mid-January complaint with a report to the Special Group at the end of January 1962 aimed at "dispelling any misconceptions which may remain concerning the degree of awareness of the Military Services" about the "importance . . . [of] military training." The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff pointed out that U.S. Armed Forces "personnel selected for MAAG, Mission, and Attaché duty" come equipped with "prior knowledge and experience related to guerrilla warfare, counter-insurgency and counter-subversion." He argued that training in "such activities as guerrilla warfare, counter-insurgency, counter-subversion, combat in cities, mob and riot control, civil affairs and military government are not new to the Military Services." The Deputy Secretary of Defense Hayden Williams provided General Taylor on March 2 with a report detailing his Department's response to each of dozens of programs and proposals. The Defense Department consistently adopted a defensive and almost confrontational tone in their communications with the president. But their reports raised the same points and described the same programs discussed the previous November in JSCM 832-61. And Lemnitzer repeated the same position again in December in the JCS response to NSAM 118. Kennedy was not satisfied.[123]

---

[123] L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair, JCS) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, JCSM 530-62, 30 Jan. 1962, "Military Training Related to Counter-Insurgency Matters (U)," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 124, 1; and Hayden Williams (Dep. ASD/ISA) to Gen. Maxwell Taylor (Chair, Special Group (CI)), memorandum, 2 Mar. 1962, "Report on Participation of U.S. and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118-JCS Proposal, Tab A-1-A-14. Kennedy Presidential Library.

## THE TOOLS OF THE TRADE

Developing a uniform standard for counterinsurgency training therefore became one of the primary responsibilities for the Special Group (CI). The continued difficulty Kennedy encountered with the military's ability to develop counterinsurgency led the president by March 1962 to order staff to develop specific "training objectives" to ensure uniformity of mission within the various entities that comprise the executive branch. As early as August 1961, General Maxwell Taylor was advised of the need to institutionalize a "comprehensive course in counter-guerrilla operations." Eight months later in NSAM 131, the National Security Advisor issued a directive to the secretaries of state and defense, the attorney general, the chairman of the joint chiefs, and the heads of the CIA, AID, and USIA requiring training for "officer grade personnel . . . who may have a role to play in counter-insurgency programs as well as in the entire range of problems involved in the modernization of developing countries." The Special Group (CI) developed the criteria contained in NSAM 131, which stressed that "personnel of all grades will be required to study the history of subversive insurgency movements, past and present, in order to familiarize themselves with . . . Communist tactics and techniques." Initially, the various Armed Services, the CIA, and the State Department would be responsible for training their personnel, with military schools and colleges taking the lead. Within the defense establishment, that responsibility fell to the Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs. Kennedy and his advisors were concerned that there was "an unfulfilled need to offer instruction on the entire range of problems" that would confront "middle and senior grade officers (both military and civilian) who

are about to occupy important posts in underdeveloped countries." Hence, the president wanted to see the institution of a "school . . . on the national level" to provide comprehensive instruction "for guiding underdeveloped countries through the modernization barrier and for countering subversive insurgency." "As a matter of urgency," the president directed the newly formed and highly secret Special Group (CI) to "explore ways of organizing" such a school.[124]

A broad array of agencies and departments quickly responded to the president touting their own counterinsurgency training efforts. Roswell Gilpatric, the deputy secretary of defense, informed the National Security Council in late February, 1962 that the Department had established a Defense Intelligence School "designed for advanced (or post graduate) intelligence staff officer and attaché training and generally will be based on (1) the postgraduate course on intelligence presently being offered at the Naval Intelligence School, and (2) the courses presently being offered at the Army Strategic Intelligence School." In response to preliminary inquiries by the Special Group (CI), the director of the Military Assistance Institute, formed a decade earlier to train Military

---

[124] McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, NSAM 131, 13 Mar. 1962, "Training Objectives for Counter-Insurgency," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 32, FN 353, Jan.-Mar., 1962, 1. NARA II; George McGhee (PPS) to Gen. Maxwell Taylor, memorandum, 7 Aug. 1961, US Counter-Guerrilla Operational and Training Capabilities," NSF, NSAM, Box 331-2, FN NSAM 88, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library; Bundy, NSAM 131, 2; William P. Bundy (ASD/ISA) to Secretary of Defense, 22 Mar. 1962, "Training Objectives for Counter-Insurgency," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 32, FN 353, Jan.-Mar., 1962, 1; Roswell Gilpatric (Dep. Sec. Def.) to Secretaries of the Military Departments, et al., memorandum, 22 Mar. 1962, "Training Objectives for Counter-Insurgency," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 32, FN 353, Jan.-Mar., 1962, 1; Bundy, NSAM 131, 2. NARA II.

Assistance Program officers, reported in January of 1962 to William Bundy, the assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs, and the Department's head of internal security matters abroad, that the Institute routinely presented courses "with particular reference to information about the country to which" MAP officers would be assigned. By May the reports began rolling in. The National War College reported that it offered a course on counterinsurgency training in May 1962. The acting director of the CIA offered its first two-week counterinsurgency course on May 28, 1962 noting that "officers preparing to command, staff and country-team positions should find this course particularly useful to identify the problems encountered in specific countries and to plan courses of action." The CIA offered a second counterinsurgency course in mid-September. The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, and the Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, offered their Departments' "cooperation in connection with this most important mission." Finally in December 1962, the Joint Chiefs submitted to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara a "proposal to provide a counterinsurgency orientation for senior executives of the major North American corporations operating in Latin America."[125]

---

[125] Roswell Gilpatric (Dep. Sec of State) to NSC, memorandum, 27 Feb. 1962, "Establishment of a Defense School," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Jan.-Mar., 1962, 1; W.B. Palmer (Dir. MAI) to ASD/ISA, memorandum, 24 Jan. 1962, "Courses of Instruction at the MAI," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Jan.—Mar., 1962, 1; Col. Goodman to Dir. of Personnel, OSD, memorandum, 12 May 1962, "Nomination to Counterinsurgency Course at National War College," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 51, FN 353 Apr.-May, 1962. 1; Lt. Gen. Marshall A. Carter (Acting Director, CIA) to Robert S. McNamara (Sec. of Def.), letter, 11 May 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs),

"The President," wrote McGeorge Bundy in National Security Action Memorandum 163 in early June, 1962, "has noted with approval the establishment of an interdepartmental seminar on counterinsurgency at the Foreign Service Institute, entitled 'Problems of Development and Internal Defense'." The Foreign Service Institute at American University in Washington, D.C. fought to become the host of the new counterinsurgency school desired by the president in NSAM 131. "In response to Presidential interest (as enunciated in NSAM 131)," the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs requested in early May, 1962 a variety of experts to participate in an "Interdepartmental Course in counterinsurgency." Specifically, William Bundy issued his orders with the approval, and likely at the behest of, the Special Group (CI). The Joint Chiefs provided, at his request, expertise on the "training and employment of local military forces for countering insurgency," with particular emphasis on "the methods of developing balanced indigenous military forces without undue strain on local resources . . . and the limitations on the use of U.S. force in internal wars." The assistant secretary wanted the army to "explain the civic action possibilities, techniques

---

Box 49, FN 352 Apr-June, 1962, 1-3; Lt. Gen. Marshall S. Carter (Acting Director, CIA) to Robert S. McNamara (Sec. of Def.), letter, 18 Sept. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64 Aug.-Oct., 1962. 1; Orville L. Freeman (Sec. of Agriculture) to Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor (Chair, Special Group, CI), letter, 14 Feb. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 56, FN 370.64 Jan.-July, 1962. 1-2; Arthur J. Goldberg (Secretary of Labor) to Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor (Chair, Special Group, CI), letter, 31 Jan. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 56, FN 370.64 Jan.-July, 1962. 1-2; and JCS to Secretary of Defense, memorandum, 22 Dec. 1962. "Counterinsurgency Orientation (U)," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64 Nov.-Dec., 1962, 1. NARA II.

and limitations of encouraging use of military forces on nation-building projects." From the Air Force came an explanation of the "limitations and requirements of force in countering insurgency." Specifically, the assistant for special operations, Paul Nitze, sought a "conceptual exposition of the U.S. general strategy and tactics of using force in counterinsurgency," including the "tailoring and integration of U.S. forces designed for counterinsurgency operations (i.e., Army Special Forces, Air Force Commando Units, Navy Seal Units)." The Director of Defense, Research and Engineering was asked to address the status of "research and development" in such areas as "mobility, intelligence systems, firepower, tactical command and control, logistics and operations research (to include analytical studies, data collection, mathematic modeling of military systems, political, social and economic systems which impinge on military systems, and historical studies relating to counterinsurgency operations" and to consider "Vietnam and Thailand as counterinsurgency laboratories" when planning his lecture. Finally, the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Special Operations offered his considered thoughts regarding "the causative factors of the insurgency" as well as the role of international Communism in sponsoring this type of subversion and the "appropriate lessons derived" from a study of the "existing situations where insurgency is active or potential."[126]

---

[126] McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to NSC, memorandum, NSAM 163, [June 1962], "Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 56, FN 370.64 Jan.-July, 1962. 1; William Bundy (ASD/ISA) to JCS, memorandum, 9 May 1962, "Interdepartmental Course on Under-development and Counterinsurgency," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Apr-June, 1962, 1-3; Paul H. Nitze (ASD/SO) to Director of Defense, Research and Development, memorandum, 23 Aug. 1962, Attachment, "Scope: Research and Development for Counterinsurgency," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security

The second inter-departmental seminar took place from September 4 through October 5, 1962 and offered a roster with a "who's who" of Administration counterinsurgency experts. Walt Rostow led off the seminar and provided instruction on "the United States approach to subversive insurgency," while Max Millikin, his former collaborator from MIT, led discussion of "U.S. policy and instruments of policy." Along with another MIT professor, Lucien Pye, Millikin provided the bulk of the instruction on issues pertaining to development, such as "the requirements and prospects for non-Communist modernization" and "agricultural and community development." Instructors, often several, from every Department gave briefings to trace the history and characteristics of subversion and the methods available to counterinsurgency. The interdepartmental seminar wanted students to know the details of the class conflicts of "transitional societies", such as those in much of Latin America, that made them especially vulnerable to Communist subversion. Of course, the seminar included a detailed briefing on "Communist goals, organization, and strategy." "Country studies" occupied the bulk of the students' time as representatives from the various federal agencies and armed services presented accounts of their current and proposed efforts at

---

Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 July – Sept. 1962, 1; Paul H. Nitze (ASD/SO) to Secretary of the Air Force, memorandum, 23 Aug. 1962, Attachment, "Scope: Limitations and Requirements of Force in Countering Insurgency," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 July – Sept. 1962, 1; Paul H. Nitze (ASD/SO) to Undersecretary of the Army for International Affairs, memorandum, 23 Aug. 1962, Attachment, "Scope: Civic Action Programs," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 July – Sept. 1962, 1; and Paul H. Nitze (ASD/SO) to Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (ISA), memorandum, 23 Aug. 1962, Attachment, "General Scope," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 July – Sept. 1962, 1. NARA II.

nation building in the underdeveloped regions of the world, Southeast Asia, Africa, the Near East, and Latin America. The State Department's Chief of Special Operations asked William Bundy to give the commencement address. The Foreign Service Institute held a third seminar November 19-21, 1962. Secretary of State Dean Rusk offered his insight and the format continued with instruction on the role of development programs offered by the United States, the nature and threat of subversion, and, finally, emphasis on the country studies approach.[127]

Not surprisingly, the various branches of the U.S. Armed Services weighed in to promote their specialized training. The army reported in May, 1962 that "a number of foreign students attend relatively long courses at the Infantry School and at the Command and General Staff College, parts of which are devoted to counter-insurgency problems, counter-guerrilla techniques and tactics." While the air force acknowledged that it needed to "increase its COIN [counterinsurgency] forces to a level that will be capable of properly fulfilling requirements," the service did point out that the U.S. Air Force had the "capability to provide training for foreign Air Force personnel which is directly or indirectly related to counter-insurgency," with such courses as "disaster control, sentry dog handling, tropic survival, air police and surface explosive disposal." Furthermore,

---

[127] George A. Carroll (CSO/S), memorandum, 30 Aug. 1962, "Distribution of Syllabus for Second Session of Interdepartmental Seminar on 'Problem of Development and Internal Defense' (Counterinsurgency)," Enclosure, "Syllabus," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64 Aug.-Oct., 1962. [9]; ibid., [2]; ibid., [6]; ibid., [2]; ibid., [3-4]; ibid., [15-20]; George A. Carroll (CSO/S) to William Bundy (ASD/ISA), memorandum, 20 Sept. 1962, "Interdepartmental Seminar on Counterinsurgency," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64 Aug.-Oct., 1962, 1; and Carroll, "Distribution of Syllabus," [1]. NARA II.

the Air Force possessed "Facilities . . .to train foreign personnel in the use of the C-130A, B, and E aircraft as well as the C 118 and C 119 aircraft. The latter has the capability of air dropping personnel and equipment and has a relatively good short field takeoff and landing characteristic." In late May, 1962, the vice commander of the Air University, Maj. Gen. C.H. Pottenger, wrote that "in July, the Air University will present the two-week USAF Counterinsurgency Course to 250 specially selected USAF officers."[128]

The navy, like every other branch of the Armed Forces, revamped its instructional curricula to include counterinsurgency training at all levels. The Assistant Secretary of the navy reported in mid May, 1962 that "identifiable blocks of instruction (history, sociology, government, political science, and economics) which contribute to counterinsurgency background are included in navy courses at the undergraduate and graduate level." The navy, he went on, incorporated counterinsurgency training into everything from OCS, pilot and submarine training as well as "supply corps school, hospital administration school and dental officer indoctrination course." At the Naval War College, the stated "objective of the counterinsurgency course is to prepare senior and middle grade officers . . . country teams, Command, Staff, and Departmental

---

[128] Col. Thomas A. Kenan to Dir. Policy Planning Staff, memorandum, 24 May 1962, "Report Required by NSAM 131," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 51, FN 353 Apr.-May, 1962. 1; Eugene M. Zuchert (Sec. of the Air Force) to Secretary of Defense, memorandum, 9 May 1962, "(U) Expansion of USAF Counterinsurgency (COIN) Capability," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 56, FN 370.64 Jan.-July, 1962. 1-2; Kenan to Policy Planning Staff, "Report Required by NSAM 131," 2; and Maj. Gen. C.H. Pottenger (Vice Commander, Air University) to Gen. Williston B. Palmer (Dir. Military Assistance, OSD), letter, 29 May 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Apr-June, 1962, 1-3. NARA II.

positions of responsibility which involve planning and conduct of counterinsurgency operations." The Naval War College emphasized the "historical background of counterinsurgency." In particular, the War College wanted students to understand the "political, economic, social and military conditions in which the selected insurgency occurred together with strategy tactics, and techniques used by the communists and by those who sought to counter the insurgency." Obviously, the Navy Special Forces represented the most important counterinsurgency arm of that Department's counterinsurgency capability. SEALs received training not only in "underwater demolition" but also in "ranger training," "airborne training", and "jungle operations." Naval MAAGs were sent to Fort Bragg in the spring of 1962 for a special six-week course in "counter-guerrilla operations," which stressed the "causative factors underlying these movements, and the doctrinal tenets therein."[129]

The army reasonably felt its Special Forces units made it the most likely branch to take the lead in counterinsurgency operations and training. Certainly, the army's Green

---

[129] Fred Korth (Asst. Sec. of the Navy) to Secretary of Defense, memorandum, 12 May 1962, "Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency (U)," Enclosure, "Navy and Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Education and Training Program," 1; idem, "Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency (U)," Enclosure, Navy and Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Education and Training Program," Tab 1, "Naval War College Pilot Course in Counterinsurgency," Appendix 1, "Navy Three-Level Program for Counterinsurgency Indoctrination," 1; idem, "Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency (U)," Enclosure, "Navy and Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Education and Training Program," Tab 1, "Naval War College Pilot Course in Counterinsurgency," 1; idem, "Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency (U)," Enclosure, "Navy and Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Education and Training Program," Tab 1, "Naval War College Pilot Course in Counterinsurgency," Appendix 1, "Navy Three-Level Program for Counterinsurgency Indoctrination," 2-3; ibid., 2; idem, "Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency (U)," Enclosure, Navy and Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Education and Training Program," Appendix 1, "Navy Three-Level Program for Counterinsurgency Indoctrination," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 51, FN 353 Apr.-May, 1962, 5; ibid., 6; and ibid., 7.

Berets were the poster child of Kennedy's counterinsurgency push. By May 1962, the army had offered counterinsurgency courses at the Special Warfare Center, the primary Special Forces base at Ft. Bragg, North Carolina, to military from Europe, the Near and Far East, and the Western Hemisphere. Five more courses took place in the last half of 1962. In addition, the army operated training facilities at "Fort Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone, in [Bishiwaka] Okinawa and at Oberammergau in Germany" for foreign military personnel. The latter two facilities did not open until fiscal year 1962. The West German camp had trained fifteen Greek cadres by May 1962, while the Bishiwaka base held over 300 courses for Asian nationals, primarily for those soldiers from Taiwan, South Korea, Thailand, and South Vietnam. "In response to the greater demand that currently exists for such training in Vietnam," the army "planned that one course will be given in Vietnamese in August 1962." By June 5, the Deputy Secretary for Defense Roswell Gilpatric provided the national security advisor with a report detailing the extent to which counterinsurgency training had permeated the defense education establishment, from every senior military school of the United States Armed Forces to specialized training for special forces in all four branches of the military. Furthermore, Gilpatric told McGeorge Bundy that "the number of foreign officers being afforded counter-insurgency instruction and training . . . is steadily increasing . . . and MAAG and Mission Chiefs have been oriented appropriately to explain these programs of instruction to their clients."[130]

---

[130] A. M. Rosenthal, "Guerrilla Base Gets U.S. Priority; Elite Officers Trained in Special Okinawa School," NYT, 10 Sept. 1961, p. A1, col. 4; Col. Thomas A. Kenan to Dir. Policy Planning Staff,

The foremost agency established to direct the modernization projects of the United States responded to the President's request for an update on counterinsurgency training on June 20, 1962. In a report to the Special Group (CI) in July 1962, the Agency for International Development (AID) touted its broad range of "counterinsurgency activities" and pledged its continuing cooperation in the "inter-agency program to develop internal defense plans for all friendly countries threatened by subversion." AID listed six "courses for Agency personnel" and two for "foreign nationals." The primary course for "AID personnel going overseas . . . has now doubled the length of its former program to two weeks of special Area Study and two days emphasis on the scope of the Communist threat." At the Institute for Internal Development at Johns Hopkins, a more intensive "twenty-one week course is given to middle grade personnel." Here, instruction concentrated on "the various activity sectors make toward economic development, and

---

memorandum, 24 May 1962, "Report Required by NSAM 131," Tab B, "Number of Courses Provided to Foreign Nationals at the U.S. Army Special Warfare School, Fort Bragg, N.C. by Fiscal Year," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 51, FN 353 Apr.-May, 1962, 1-5; John E. Moore (Director of Personnel, OSD), administrative memorandum, 26 June 1962, "Counterinsurgency and Special Warfare Course," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Apr-June, 1962, 1; Kenan to Dir. Policy Planning Staff, memorandum, "Report Required by NSAM 131," 2; idem, "Report Required by NSAM 131," Tab E, "Number of Counter-Insurgency Courses Provided Foreign Nationals at Oberammergau by Fiscal Year," 1; idem, "Report Required by NSAM 131," Tab D, "Number of Counter-Insurgency Courses Provided Foreign Nationals at Okinawa by Fiscal Year," 1; idem, "Report Required by NSAM 131," Tab A, "Number of Counter-Insurgency Courses Provided Foreign Nationals in the CONUS and Overseas by Fiscal Year," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 51, FN 353 Apr.-May, 1962. 3. NARA II; Roswell Gilpatric (Dep. Sec. of Def.) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, 5 June 1962, "Department of Defense Report on NSAM 131 – Training Objectives for Counter-Insurgency," Annex, "Counterinsurgency Training for U.S. and Foreign Officers in U.S. Military Schools and Colleges," 1-12; and idem, "Department of Defense Report on NSAM 131 – Training Objectives for Counter-Insurgency," NSF, NSAM, Box 334, FN NSAM 131—Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency Memoranda, 6/1-6/4/62, 2. Kennedy Presidential Library.

emphasizes the effect on economic development of social, cultural, and political conditions." For senior AID officers, "A.I.D. is participating in the development of the national modernization and counter-insurgency school." Not surprisingly, AID emphasized "economic and social development programs through the Alliance for Progress" in Latin America. In the same vein, the agency described the range of civic action activities around the world as part of their "specific counter-insurgency programs." In the region, AID wrote that "programs are underway in Honduras, Paraguay, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and Chile. Guatemala and Brazil have had programs for a number of years with the need for U.S. assistance."[131]

**INTERNAL SECURITY**

Congressional opposition to internal security training of Latin American military continued to limit the Kennedy administration's efforts to counter Communist subversion in the hemisphere. The State Department placed the blame squarely in the hands of Senator Wayne Morse, the Democratic senator from Oregon. Staffers correctly argued that Senator Morse sought to inhibit internal security training by requiring the president himself to make the determination of need. Morse had a well-earned reputation as an opponent of internal security aid and training to Latin America. He chaired the

[131] Frank M. Coffin (Dep. Admin. for Ops., AID) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 18 July 1962, "A.I.D. Supported Counterinsurgency Activities," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 56, FN 370.64 Jan.-July, 1962. 1, 5; Dennis Brennan (PRCA/AID) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 20 June 1960, "Agency for International Development Response to NSAM 131," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 51, FN 353 June-August, 1962. 2; ibid., 5; ibid., 2; Coffin to Special Group (CI), "A.I.D. Supported Counterinsurgency Activities," 2-3. NARA II.

Subcommittee for the American Republics on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and, as such, he possessed considerable institutional power over legislation, especially with regard to military and economic aid packages. Morse did not hesitate to make use of his authority, and during his tenure he routinely frustrated Defense and State Department staffers with his pointed attacks on their efforts to secure funding for various programs.[132]

Morse opposed military aid to Latin America on principle and as a matter of policy. He preferred a "deemphasis on military assistance." Morse did not believe that the United States should fund dictators, and he felt that military aid and training – especially for internal security – only strengthened the repressive control of the "tight little oligarchies" that so plagued the region. Like many in Congress, Morse also feared that giving military hardware to Latin America would lead to an arms race that would "invite chaos" and intra-regional warfare. Most important, Congress felt that the emphasis on military assistance took money and effort away from economic development. Morse laid the groundwork for Jimmy Carter when he opposed military aid to dictators and argued that the United States should reward democratic or democratizing governments with economic aid, and exclude aid to authoritarian ones.

---

[132] J. O. Bell (DC/For. Asst.) to Dean Rusk (Sec. of State), memorandum, 26 June 1961, "Proposed Presidential Determination under Section 105(b)(4) of the MSA of 1954 [sic], as amended, permitting the use of funds to furnish military assistance to Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and Haiti," Item # 77, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 177; Arthur Robert Smith, The Tiger in the Senate: The Biography of Wayne Morse (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1962); and Mason Drukman, Wayne Morse: A Political Biography (Portland: Oregon Historical Society Press, 1997).

Morse did believe in economic development. He fought with Eisenhower to increase economic assistance for just that reason. But, he did not accept President Kennedy's insistence that internal security training must become a concomitant part of the process.[133]

The Kennedy administration worked hard to convince Congress to dispense with the restrictions on internal security training to Latin America. The Defense Department, amidst strenuous efforts to reorient its hemispheric defense posture, had argued in May 1961 that the United States must "in our military programs, give first priority to measures designed to meet the threat to internal security." In order to secure the necessary funding, the Department of Defense wanted the administration to "seek the repeal of the Morse Amendment" to foreign aid, which limited foreign aid to internal security purposes. The president's supporters in Congress did manage to modify somewhat the language in the 1961 funding to include some "new concepts." The law spoke generally about the United States' responsibility to provide military training and assistance that would permit "friendly countries . . . to deter or, if necessary, defeat Communist or Communist-supported aggression . . . to maintain internal security, and creat[e] an environment of security and stability in the developing countries." On June 26, 1961, the State

---

[133] Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Sub-Committee on the American Republics, South America: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela, Wayne Morse Study Mission to South America, 86th Cong., 2d sess., 20 Feb. 1960 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960), 7; ibid., 2; J. Lloyd Mecham, The United States and Inter-American Security, 1889-1960 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961), 339-40; Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, South America, Wayne Morse Study Mission, 7-8; and Burton I. Kaufman, Trade and Aid: Eisenhower's Foreign Economic Policy, 1953-1961 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), 133-52.

Department sought authorization for internal security training for the nations of Central America and Haiti for just those reasons. But Congress balked and kept the "long-standing congressional prohibition on aid to Latin America for internal security purposes" in Section 511(b) of the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act. Sub-section 105(b)(4) prohibited internal security aid "unless the president determines otherwise." Congress did not forbid internal security assistance; it adopted the Morse Amendment to force the president to officially commit the United States to internal security training in Latin America. In Executive Order 10893, President Eisenhower sought to side-step Congress by authorizing the secretary of state to make the decision. So Morse revised the 1961 Mutual Security Act and revised section 105(b)(4), which now required that the president "promptly reports such determination to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives." In late September 1961, Chester Bowles, acting for Secretary of State Dean Rusk, revised the request for internal security training in Central America according to the new dictates of the 1961 act.[134]

---

[134] Haydn Williams (Dep. ASD/ISA) to Adolph Berle (Chair, Task Force on Immediate Problems in Latin America), Letter, 28 June 1961, Enclosure, paper, 19 May 1961, "U.S. Policy for the Security of Latin America in the Sixties," Item # 76, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 176; Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs, 10. NARA II; in ibid., 11; J. O. Bell (DC/For. Asst.) to Dean Rusk (Sec. of State), Memorandum, 26 June 1961, "Proposed Presidential Determination under Section 105(b)(4) of the MSA of 1954 as amended, permitting the use of funds to furnish military assistance to Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and Haiti," Item #77, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 176-7; Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs, 11. NARA II; Chester Bowles (Acting Sec. of State) to President Kennedy, Memorandum, 29 September 1961, "Determination Under Sections 511(b) and 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as Amended, Permitting the Use of Funds in Order to Furnish Military Assistance to Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala," Item #85, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 187-90; Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs, 11. NARA II; and Bowles to President Kennedy, "Determination Under Sections 511(b) and 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act," Item #85, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 187-90.

The Kennedy administration failed again in 1962 to remove the restrictions on internal security aid and training. As Chair of the Subcommittee for the American Republics, Morse could effectively stifle any alterations to internal security aid including the amount of funding available. So in March 1962, Undersecretary of State George Ball went through legislative channels to ask Senator Morse if he would consider raising the ceiling on MAP spending for internal security training and aid. Instead, the senator responded that he felt the limit should be lowered. The Chief of Western Hemisphere Affairs for the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs testified before Congress in June of 1962 in an effort "to repeal the prohibition against the use of military assistance for internal security purposes in Latin America." General W. A. Enemark argued that, in order for the Alliance for Progress to succeed, the "security forces in Latin America . . . must have the effective force required to cope with subversion." Congress refused to modify the restrictions any further, so Kennedy responded by once again delegating authority to the secretary of state. Senator Morse in a letter to the secretary of state in August, 1962 put his concerns bluntly when he countered that "for many years I have been appalled at the apparent lack of concern of the Department of Defense in providing political orientation and training to foreign military personnel brought to the United States for training." He went on to stress that he and the members of his subcommittee felt very strongly that "officials in the executive branch"

did not seem to comprehend the "implications and dangers of our military assistance programs to Latin America."[135]

The administration then took its fight to the full Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Hubert Humphrey stepped in with a strongly worded note to the secretary of defense in October of 1962 requesting an update on United States counterinsurgency capabilities. In a politely worded response, the secretary provided a detailed report of the variety of American assets, ranging from the various special forces units to the development of specific weapons and surveillance devices. Secretary McNamara then sent a letter to Senator Richard Russell, the Chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and assured him that the "full services of the Department of Defense are available for any briefings you might care to receive." It would not be until 1965, with the war in Vietnam underway, that Congress would agree to lift the restrictions on MAP training and aid for internal security.[136]

---

[135] Edwin M. Martin (AS/ARA) and Carl Marcy (COS, Senate For. Rels. Comm.) Department of State, memorandum of conversation, 30 Mar. 1962, "Military Assistance Program for Latin America," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Central Decimal File, 1960-1963, Box 1516, FN 720.5/2-962, 1; Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs, 15; U.S., House Committee on Foreign Affairs Hearings, Foreign Assistance Act 1962 87th Cong., 1st Sess, 268, cited in Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs, 15; Hollis B. Chenery (Dir., Program Review and Coord. Staff, AID) to Gen. W. B. Palmer (Dir. Military Assistance, ASD/ISA), letter, 9 July 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 51, FN 353 June-August, 1962. 1; William P. Bundy (Act. Asst. Sec. of Def.) to Secretary of the Army, memorandum, 19 Aug. 1962, "Role of the U.S. in Providing Military Assistance to Latin American Countries," Inclosure, Wayne Morse to Dean Rusk (Secretary of State), letter, 3 Aug. 1962, RG FN Latin America, OSA 092.3 Latin America FW 8-9-62, 1-3. NARA II.

[136] Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey to Robert S. McNamara (Sec. of Def.), letter, 18 Oct. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64 17 Sept. 1962. 1; Robert S. McNamara (Sec. of Def.) to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, letter, 27 Nov. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64

In the meantime, training Latin American police offered a means to bypass congressional opposition to internal security aid while buttressing Latin American capabilities to secure public safety. The decision to actively include Latin American police forces in the maintenance of internal security represented a departure from Eisenhower's policy. In June 1959, Assistant Secretary of State for the American Republics Roy Rubottom argued that any effort to bolster police internal security capacity in Latin America would be "unrealistic." He pointed out that "the traditional role of the military in the area is to maintain mutual security." And Rubottom believed that if the United States sought to "encourage police and constabulary type units to usurp this function," such a policy would likely derail "our objectives of promoting political stability and economic progress." But in NSAM 56, President Kennedy called for an assessment of American "paramilitary assets," and police were considered by the president among the more valuable to combat subversion. The president sought with the Alliance for Progress to collapse the modernization process in Latin America. The disruptions produced by the modernization of traditional societies, argued one senior Defense Department report, generated increased "anomic behavior of individuals" which manifested itself "in crime, delinquency, alcoholism, suicide, and mental disease."

---

Nov.-Dec., 1962, 1; William P. Bundy (Dep. Asst. Sec. of Def.) to Secretary of Defense, memorandum, 26 Nov. 1962, "Inadequacy of This Country's Preparations for Waging Effective Guerrilla and Counter-Guerrilla Warfare," Tab A-D, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64 Nov.-Dec., 1962, 1; and Robert S. McNamara (Sec. of Def.) to Richard Russell (Chair, Senate Armed Services Committee), letter, 5 Dec. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64 Nov.-Dec., 1962, 1. NARA II.

"Expansion of police," the report continued, "would also seem an essential condition" to battle both individual and group-based disruptive behavior and thereby maintain the necessary "national stability that will encourage foreign and domestic investments leading to economic growth."[137]

The capacity of Latin American police forces to meet this need, however, remained dubious. General Lemnitzer, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, informed the president on May 19, 1961 that the "training of civilian police forces in Latin America is under [the direction of] the International Cooperation Administration." The general pointed out that "in Latin America, police forces are suspect and among the first to be reorganized by the new administration as a necessary adjunct to the administration remaining in office." Furthermore, he noted pessimistically that "in most Latin American countries the security and police forces have a marginal capacity to perform their functions." Latin American nations could generate popular support for internal security measures against Communist subversion, the general argued "if the police forces are developed as a competent professional force with minimal overtones of political connivance." Robert Kennedy believed that the FBI could assist Latin American nations.

---

[137] Roy Rubottom (A/ARA) to NSC, memorandum, [June 1959], "NSC 5902/1," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Records of the Special Assistant on Communism, 1958-1962, Box 2, FN NSC Miscellaneous 1959, 1; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, NSAM 56, 28 June 1961, "Evaluation of Paramilitary Requirements," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-1 Natl. Security Council (NSAM Memoranda), 1; McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 189; and Atlantic Research Corporation to ASD/ISA, 15 Aug. 1962, "A Study of National Internal Security Forces with Special Reference to the Role of Such Forces in the Context of an International Agreement for General and Complete Disarmament, Interim Report," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 57, FN 381 Oct. 1962, 38. NARA II.

But, he warned the president in September 1961, the FBI had found that the "security arrangements in a number of countries were extremely deficient" and he feared whether existing Latin American forces would be able to stifle a riot used as prelude to a Communist overthrow. By Thanksgiving 1961, the national security advisor, at the behest of the president, directed the secretary of state in NSAM 114 to develop "a continuing review . . . of the over-all problem of United States support of friendly police and armed forces and their training in riot control, counter-subversion, counter-insurgency, and related operations."[138]

The president pushed to make sure that his administration did not neglect this facet of internal security. On February 19, 1962, President Kennedy issued NSAM 132 to Fowler Hamilton, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development. Kennedy wrote, "I desire the appropriate agencies . . . to give the utmost attention and emphasis to programs designed to counter Communist indirect aggression." For the president, "police assistance programs . . . are also a crucial element in our response to this challenge." While acknowledging that "such programs may seem marginal in terms of focusing our energies on those key sectors which will contribute most to sustained

---

[138] L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair, JCS) to President Kennedy, memorandum, 19 May 1961, "Training of Police and Armed Forces of Latin America (U)," President's Office Files, Country Files, Box 121A FN LA, Security, 1960-1963, 1-2. Kennedy Presidential Library; Robert F. Kennedy (Attorney General) to President Kennedy, memorandum, 11 September 1961, Item #82, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 182. Noted in Rabe, Most Dangerous Area, 131; and McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Dean Rusk (Secretary of State), memorandum, NSAM 114, 22 Nov. 1961, "Training for Friendly Police and Armed Forces in Counter-Insurgency, Counter-Subversion, Riot Control and Related Matters," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-1 Natl. Security Council (NSAM Memoranda), 1. NARA II. See also Rabe, Most Dangerous Area, 131, and McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 189, for discussion of the implementation of NSAM 114.

economic growth," Kennedy went on to argue that they are indeed "justified" since they "contribut[e] to internal security and resisting Communist-supported insurgency." President Kennedy reiterated his desire to coordinate foreign police training in NSAM 146, issued in late April 1962, which established an Inter-Departmental Committee on Police Assistance Programs to work under the direction of the Special Group (CI). This committee spent the late spring and early summer developing a the coordinated structure for police training of foreign nationals. The administration re-emphasized the importance of police forces in the overall counterinsurgency scheme in June 1962 in NSAM 162. When McGeorge Bundy issued the new guidance for developing "country internal defense plans," to the Special Group (CI), he took care to emphasize the continued need to develop "U.S. and indigenous police and paramilitary and military resources." Bundy insisted that a broad array of "police, intelligence, and psychological measures" were needed to maintain internal security, itself the necessary prerequisite for economic development.[139]

Kennedy once again turned to the Agency for International Development to ensure public safety in Latin America. The Inter-Departmental Committee on Police Assistance Programs issued its final report on July 24, 1962. The President's intelligence

---

[139] President Kennedy to Fowler Hamilton (Admin. AID), memorandum, NSAM 132, 19 Feb. 1962, "Support of Local Police Forces for Internal Security and Counter-Insurgency Purposes," Records of the AID, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Box 5, FN National Security Council (NSAM Memoranda), 1-2. NARA II; President Kennedy to Special Group (CI), NSAM 146, memorandum, 24 Apr. 1962, "Inter-Departmental Committee on Police Programs," NSF, Meetings and Memoranda, Box 336-7, FN NSAM 146, 1-2. Kennedy Presidential Library; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, NSAM 162, 19 June 1962, "Development of U.S. Indigenous Police, Paramilitary, and Military Resources," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 58, FN 381 Apr.-June, 1962, 1-4. NARA II.

advisor, Robert W. Komer, wholeheartedly supported the preeminent role proposed for AID and argued for an action memorandum to make that effective. On August 7, 1962, President Kennedy implemented the Committee's recommendations when he issued NSAM 177. The president insisted that "the US should give considerably greater emphasis to police assistance programs." Under this directive, AID now bore the responsibility for the planning and training of indigenous police forces. The president told the agency's top administrator, Fowler Hamilton, that same day that "I consider this program an important part of our effort to help the less-developed countries achieve internal security essential if our major economic development aid is to help create viable free nations." The president added further that "I hope that you . . . will give your personal attention to hiring the best professionals you can find to launch this re-invigorated effort." And to keep the review of police training current, AIDs Special Assistant for Internal Defense Joseph Wolf announced on December 13, 1962 the first meeting of the new permanent body, the Interagency Police Group.[140]

---

[140] William Brubeck (Exec. Sec., ICPP) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, 24 July 1962, "Report of the Committee on Police Assistance Programs," Enclosure 2, "Report of the Interagency Committee on Police Assistance Programs in Newly Emerging Countries," NSF, NSAM, Box 336-7, FN NSAM 146, 1-22; Robert W. Komer (Spec. Asst. ISA) to the President, note, 29 July 1962, "Report of the Committee on Police Assistance Programs," NSF, NSAM, Box 336-7, FN NSAM 146, 1-22; President Kennedy to NSC, NSAM 177, memorandum, 7 Aug. 1962, "Police Assistance Programs," NSF, NSAM, Box 338-9, FN NSAM 177, 1-3. Kennedy Presidential Library. See also McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 189-90; and Rabe, Most Dangerous Area, 132. Kennedy, NSAM 177, 1-3. Kennedy Presidential Library; President Kennedy to Fowler Hamilton (Admin. AID), letter, 7 Aug. 1962, NSF, Meetings and Memoranda, Box 336, FN NSAM 146, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library; and Joseph Wolf (Spec. Asst. Internal Def.) to Frank M. Coffin (Acting Admin. AID/OPS), memorandum, 13 Dec. 1962, "Police Assistance Program," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-2 Special Group (CI) Meetings – December 1962, 1. NARA II.

AID was ready for its new responsibilities. The agency had already responded to the earlier directive, NSAM 132, when it proudly reported to the Special Group (CI) in June 1962 that "the number of technicians assigned doubled in 1962 [and] . . . the number of police officials trained at U.S. expense increased by 100 in 1962 over the 1961 level." AID quickly responded again when it established the "semi-autonomous" Office of Public Safety on November 1, 1962 to carry out NSAM 177. The director of this office reported to the Special Assistant for Internal Defense within the AID hierarchy. By December, the Office reported to the president that spending on police training had "doubled" for the coming year's budget. And, for AID, "the most significant development during the last eighteen months was the establishment of an Inter-American Police Academy in Panama . . . opened in July 1962" at Ft. Davis in the Panama Canal Zone. Many in the administration viewed the Inter-American Police Academy as a key component to maintaining internal security in Latin America. The idea originated at the end of September, 1961. Chester Bowles as the Acting Secretary of State offered his considered thoughts to the president's call in NSAM 88 with the proposal of establishing an American police training facility as a clearing house for riot control and other training. In mid-October of that year, National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy responded in NSAM 106, where he wrote that "the President has expressed interest in the proposal . . . to establish a U.S. police academy, preferably in a Caribbean location such as the Canal Zone." The Alliance for Progress spawned a broad array of administrative entities to deal with the pernicious threat of Communist subversion. Among these, reported the Caribbean Command in its annual history for 1962, was "the establishment, on an interim

basis, of the Inter-American Police Academy." But IAPA was more than just one of a hodgepodge of programs; Kennedy saw upgrading Latin American police capabilities as a serious need.[141]

AID took care to detail the success of the first six months of the Inter-American Policy Academy. AID's Office of Public Safety reported to the Special Group (CI) just before Christmas 1962 that "since the opening July 2, ninety officers from 15 Latin American countries have graduated from IAPA courses." In the Basic Police Operations, course instruction included: "traffic, firearms, investigations, riot control, defensive tactics, police organization and administration, training for police instructors, human and public relations, and counter-intelligence." AID praised the "coordination and cooperation between the IAPA and nearby U.S. military training centers" and noted that "students from the IAPA and the Military Police School at Fort Gulick participated in a

---

[141] Frank M. Coffin (Dep. Admin. for Ops. AID) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 18 July 1962, "A.I.D. Supported Counterinsurgency Activities," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 56, FN 370.64 Jan.-July, 1962, 4. NARA II; McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 189; AID, general notice, 1 Nov. 1962, "Office of Public Safety (O/PS)," NSF, NSAM, Box 338-9, FN NSAM 177, 1-2. Kennedy Presidential Library; Department of State and AID to President Kennedy, memorandum, 1 Dec. 1962, "Police Assistance Programs," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-2 Special Group (CI) Meetings – December 1962, 1-8. NARA II; McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 189; Chester Bowles (Acting Sec. of State) to President Kennedy, letter, 30 Sept. 1961, Enclosure, Chester Bowles (Acting Secretary of State) to President Kennedy, memorandum, 30 Sept. 1961, "Counter-Subversion training for Latin American Police Forces," NSF, NSAM, Box 331-2, FN NSAM 88, 1-4. Kennedy Presidential Library; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Dean Rusk (Sec. of State), memorandum, NSAM 106, 19 Oct. 1961, "Request for Report on Proposal to Establish a U.S. Police Academy," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-1 Natl. Security Council (NSAM Memoranda), 1. NARA II; Macon A. Hipp, Headquarters, Caribbean Command, Caribbean Command Annual History, 1962, HMF, 8-2A.8 AA 1962, VI, 7. CMH. See Barber and Ronning, Internal Security, 98; Brian Loveman and Thomas M. Davies, Jr., eds., The Politics of Antipolitics: The Military in Latin America, 2d rev. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 164; and John Child, Unequal Alliance: The Inter-American Military System, 1938-1978 (Boulder: Westview, 1980), 156.

joint exercise on a riot situation where the correlated role of the civil police and the military in riot control was demonstrated." AID allocated additional monies that enabled IAPA to help to "defray cost of travel to the Academy," something the U.S. Army Caribbean School had done for years." IAPA echoed many of the early U.S. Army Caribbean School difficulties, including "recruiting experienced civil police personnel with the language fluency required." And like the school, IAPA touted the "professional relationships developed between students at IAPA" which, it was contended, "will result in increasing communication and cooperation between countries."[142]

By 1970, AID trained nearly 3000 Latin American police. Brazil was the Latin American nation most likely to take advantage of the executive course. Training, and the desire for police training, however, did not mean that Latin Americans shared U.S. notions of how to employ said police training. In March 1964, the head of the Office of Public Safety for Latin America reported to AID that the "police and security units lack capability to contain terrorist offensive, particularly if state of siege is lifted as anticipated." D. R. Powell attributed "this weakness" to the "government of Guatemala," which he contended "has not yet properly supported the development of civil police capabilities and has not really cooperated with our efforts to date." Perhaps, he continued, the government hoped for a "resumption of large scale urban disorder and

[142] Department of State, AID/OPS to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 19 Dec. 1962, "Status Report on Inter-American Police Academy (IAPA)," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-2 Special Group (CI) Meetings – December 1962, 1. NARA II; ibid., 2; ibid., 3; ibid., 1; and ibid., 2.

terrorism could be an excuse for the regime to reinstate siege and 'demonstrate' continuing need for military rule."[143]

The Office of Public Safety fought to keep the training of Latin American police at Ft. Davis in the Canal Zone. In early proposals promoting IAPA, AID listed the cost savings of a Panama facility and the "unusual opportunity for concentrated effort to increase capabilities of police and related internal security agencies in the security and counter subversion field." General Enemark, in his capacity as Regional Director of the Western Hemisphere for the Department of Defense, agreed with the "desirability of locating school in Canal Zone." The man assigned to head the proposed Academy, Frank Coffin, pushed the benefits of a Panama location with Roswell Gilpatric in late March. Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs William Bundy believed "it would be a mistake to establish the school at Ft. Randolph" in Washington, D.C. because of the inadequate facilities that existed there. Instead, the national security advisor's brother recommended that "the school should be located in the Canal Zone, because the U.S. Army and Air Force already have schools there for training Latin Americans [in] internal security activities closely related to those which will be taught at the IAPA." But the formation of the Interagency Police Group on December 1, 1962

[143] Department of State, AID/OPS, "Training Statistics FY 63-FY 70: Worldwide Summary," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 11, FN IPS 21-2 Reports and Statistics (OPS Training Program), [Latin America], [1]; ibid., [1-12]; and D. R. Powell (OPS/LA) to Administrator AID/OPS, memorandum, 17 Mar. 1964, "Guatemala Internal Defense Plan Quarterly Progress Report," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 6, FN IPS 7-2 Special Group (CI) Meetings March 1964, 1. NARA II.

eventually spelled the end of training in Panama. The IPG wanted to maintain direct control of the training regimen and formed the International Police Academy in Washington, D.C. in mid-December. The Commanding General of the U.S. Army Caribbean countered that "it is important for the Academy to remain in Panama, in order to foster understanding and respect between the military and police students to be trained at Fort Gulick and the Academy." The Special Group (CI) disagreed and the "Canal Zone School was phased out."[144]

**THE SUBVERSIVE THREAT**

President Kennedy wanted systems in place to enable the United States to respond to the subversive challenges posed by international Communism in the underdeveloped

---

[144] Brig. Gen. William Enemark (Reg. Dir. Western Hemisphere, OSD/ISA) to CINCARIB, telegram, [10], Apr. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Apr-June, 1962, 1-2; E.C. Kennely (AID/OPS), 14 Feb. 1962, "Summary Facts Concerning the Inter-American Academy Panama Canal Zone," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-2 Special Group (CI) Meetings Prior to Nov. 1962, 1; Brig. Gen. W.A. Enemark (Reg. Dir., West. Hemi, ASD/ISA) to Lt. Gen. O'Meara (CGUSARCARIB), Telegram, [13] Mar. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Jan.—Mar., 1962, 1; Frank M. Coffin (Dep. Administrator IAPA) to Roswell Gilpatric (Dep. Sec. of Def.), letter, 29 Mar. 1962, RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Jan.-Mar., 1962, 1; William S. Bundy (ASD/ISA) to Roswell Gilpatric (Dep. Sec. of Def.), memorandum, 5 Apr. 1962, "Inter-American Police Academy," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Apr-June, 1962, 2; Department of State, AID to the President, memorandum, 1 Dec. 1962, "Police Assistance Programs," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-2 Special Group (CI) Meetings – December 1962, 1-8; Joseph Wolf (Spec. Asst. Internal Def.) to Frank M. Coffin (Acting Administrator, AID/OPS), memorandum, 13 Dec. 1962, "Police Assistance Program," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-2 Special Group (CI) Meetings – December 1962, 1; Thomas M. Davis (Exec. Sec., Special Group (CI)), memorandum, 20 Dec. 1962, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Special Group (CI)," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64 Nov.-Dec., 1962, 2. NARA II; and McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 190.

world. He had pushed and prodded his administration to develop guidelines and protocols for the United States. He created the Special Group (CI) and infused it with purpose and power. The United States now boasted a variety of agencies and a plethora of avenues through which Kennedy could assert his authority around the world. The International Police Academy represented simply one avenue designed to assure public safety in Latin America, and the move of the facility reflected the growing desire to direct the U.S. activities from Washington, D.C. It also reflected the shifting importance of Latin America within the Kennedy administration. While the region held great significance for the president during his first year in office, and the construction of Soviet missile bases in Cuba bid fair to consume the world in nuclear war in the fall of 1962, Southeast Asia increasingly occupied the attention – and concern – of President Kennedy and his staff. The growing threat of Communist subversion in Laos, the increasingly violent opposition to the Diem regime in South Vietnam, and the growing tensions in Thailand, Indonesia, and elsewhere in the region bespoke the need for greater internal security capabilities in underdeveloped nations to help combat this insidious form of Communist aggression. Ideally, Kennedy wanted the Special Group (CI) to assess threat levels and coordinate the United States' response. To do that, the United States still needed a standard method, an operating guide, for assessing, developing, and ensuring internal security within the underdeveloped world. The Special Group (CI) provided the requisite manual as the summer of 1962 waned.[145]

---

[145] McClintock, Instruments of Statecraft, 161-257; and Barber and Ronning, Internal Security, 91-140.

The Special Group (CI) completed work on the "U.S. overseas internal defense policy" on August 24, 1962. The various Departments and agencies within the United States government had struggled to adequately define the range of threats that existed within underdeveloped countries. Special Assistant for Internal Defense Joseph Wolf noted in late May 1962 that in addition to the "effective mobilization of the local government's political, economic, and military and psychological resources and their employment in a unified and coordinated manner," the historical success of insurgent movements has rested on "their ability to enlist popular support against real or fancied grievances together with their capacity for employing minimum force to create widespread insecurity." For the United States, therefore, any "program to counter Communist subversion and insurgency must include both measures designed to eliminate causes of discontent." Accordingly, Kennedy added the Director of the United States Information Agency to the Special Group (CI) in NSAM 180. The president wanted an effective propaganda mechanism to counter the blandishments of worldwide Communism. When briefing the secretary of state on NSAM 182, Deputy Secretary of State U. Alexis Johnson, now the executive secretary of the Special Group (CI), directed Secretary Rusk to the "sections of the paper on the 'Causes of Insurgency' [and] 'Communist Doctrine and Tactics', as expressed in stages." U. Alexis Johnson also stressed the pre-eminent role of the State Department, particularly that of the ambassador, in assessing and implementing what he essentially viewed as a political problem. General Taylor disagreed, and made sure to insert an important addendum to NSAM 182 that directed the Department of Defense to "support the CIA in clandestine operations" as

well as to "execute assigned [deleted word] operations . . . which require . . . military experience of a kind and level peculiar to the Armed Services."[146]

Specifically, NSAM 182 sought the "defeat of (1) communist inspired, supported, or directed subversion or insurgency . . . which are inimical to U.S. national security interests in all countries of the free world, primarily those that are underdeveloped." This new manual for combating subversion drew attention to the success of insurgents in Algeria, French Indochina, and Cuba to emphasize the reality of this threat and the example each of these movements represents to future insurgent groups. The Special Group (CI) argued that Communist subversion followed clearly defined stages, from "building a power base" to limited tactical armed action, to strategic resistance against established regimes. Since each stage had its own purpose designed to take advantage of the vulnerability of developing nations, the United States must perforce deny to Communism the efforts of the people of underdeveloped nations. Civic action programs

---

[146] McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, NSAM 124, "Counterinsurgency Doctrine," Tab A, "U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy," NSF, NSAM, Box 338-9, FN NSAM 182, 1-31. Kennedy Presidential Library; Joseph Wolf (Spec. Asst. Internal Def.) to Area Desks, memorandum, 20 May 1963, "Special Group (CI) Review of Country Internal Defense Plans," Enclosure, Joint Message #CA-236, 6 July 1962, "Internal Defense Plans – Revised Format," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-2 Special Group (CI) General, 2; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to NSC, memorandum, NSAM 180, 13 Aug. 1962, "Membership of the Special Group (CI)," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 55, FN 370.64 Aug.-Oct., 1962. 1; U. Alexis Johnson (Special Group (CI)) to Secretary of State, memorandum, 8 Aug. 1962, "U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 1, FN Special Group (CI) 8/1/62-10/31/62, 1-2. NARA II; and McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, NSAM 124, "Counterinsurgency Doctrine," Tab A, "U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy," Annex A, "Supplementary Role of the Department of Defense," NSF, NSAM, Box 338-9, FN NSAM 182, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library.

served the crucial dual purpose in this phase of the battle; they built up fragile developing infrastructures while securing the will of a developing nation's people to economic development. The Special Group (CI) did not ignore psychological warfare. Instead, psychological warfare served as a tactic, like counterinsurgency, that could be applied to negate subversive action and promote acceptance of economic and social changes fostered to promote economic modernization. Development represented the clearest method to forestall, permanently, Communist expansion in the underdeveloped world. And it was the Special Group (CI) which bore the responsibility of identifying the existing threat levels and applying the commensurate action by the broad range of U.S. assets available. While the Agency for International Development would bear the lion's share of the responsibility for stimulating economic development in threatened nations, a key component of the Department of Defense's responsibilities included providing police, paramilitary, and military equipment, advisors, and training to insure the requisite internal security.[147]

The growing emphasis the Special Group (CI) placed on Southeast Asia in 1962 directed its approach to enhancing Latin American internal security. With the mandate of NSAM 182, the Special Group (CI) spent most of their time reviewing country reports and assessing the level of United States response. Initially, President Kennedy directed

---

[147] Bundy to Special Group (CI), NSAM 124, "Counterinsurgency Doctrine," Tab A, "U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy," 1; ibid., 2-3; ibid., 8-10; ibid., 13-19; ibid., 6-8; and idem, NSAM 124, "Counterinsurgency Doctrine," Tab A, "U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Policy," Annex C, "Model Outline of Country Internal Defense Plan," NSF, NSAM, Box 338-9, FN NSAM 182, 1-2. Kennedy Presidential Library.

the Group's efforts toward "Laos, South Viet-Nam, [and] Thailand." And for the remainder of 1962, Laos occupied much of the Group's attention. By the time the Special Group (CI) completed NSAM 182, the level of administration attention toward Southeast Asia had increased. In October of 1962, the Group's general concern for Southeast Asia led to a concerted effort in Indonesia. The members offered to the President a detailed "plan of action" that included an analysis of the economic history of the nation and how their current "balance of payments" status affected their capacity to meet their foreign obligations, primarily to the Netherlands. To assist this young nation, and to forestall the Communist advance in the region, the Special Group (CI) recommended the intercession of substantial foreign aid along with military and paramilitary training. Most of all, the members were concerned about the "potential for non-Communist insurgent activities," which the Special Group (CI) warned could "be found throughout Indonesia." To this end they wanted to send in the Peace Corps. In mid-June 1962, the president accepted General Taylor's recommendation and widened the scope of the Special Group's purview in NSAM 165 when he added several countries: Cambodia, Cameroon, Burma, Iran, Ecuador, Colombia, Venezuela, and Guatemala. General Lemnitzer originally proposed that the Special Group (CI) add those countries to the list back on February 8, 1962.[148]

---

[148] President Kennedy to Special Group (CI), memorandum, NSAM 124 Annex, 18 Jan. 1962, "Annex to National Security Action memorandum No. 124," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 56, FN 370.64 Jan.-July, 1962, 1; George W. Ball (Undersecretary of State) to the President, memorandum, 10 Oct. 1962, "Plan of Action for Indonesia," 1-3; idem, "Plan of Action for Indonesia," Enclosures 1-3; idem, "Plan of Action for Indonesia," Enclosures 9 and 11; idem, "Plan of Action for Indonesia," Enclosure 7, 1;

Periodic threats to established military regimes did involve the Special Group's attention. In September 1962, the Special Group did receive a briefing from the Director of the Central American Office, Katherine Bracken, who told the members of the Group how Nicaraguan "exile groups use Honduras and Costa Rica for safe havens and staging areas" for their periodic efforts to dislodge the Somoza family. Mrs. Bracken also referred to a State request for American patrols of the Nicaraguan coast along its borders in an effort to stymie the flow of arms into the country. McGeorge Bundy promised to "review the status of this proposal," but the Group decided it needed to take no action at that time. When the Special Group decided to intercede, they brought the full range of U.S. government agencies and departments to bear, putting into play the mechanisms they, and the Kennedy administration, had worked to establish in the preceding months. Events in fall 1962 in Guatemala called for a delicate balancing act. In what Undersecretary of State George Ball hailed as "one of the most carefully prepared and reviewed of all the Internal Defense Plans," the Special Group sought to promote a greater "understanding by Guatemalans of the objectives of the Alianza para el Progreso" while maintaining good relations with a nation that "has followed a strong anti-

---

idem, "Plan of Action for Indonesia," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 1, FN Special Group (CI) 8/1/62-10/31/62, Enclosure 12. NARA II; Maj. Gen. Maxwell Taylor (Chair, Special Group (CI)) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, 14 June 1962, "Assignment of Additional Responsibility to the Special Group (CI)," NSF, NSAM, Box 336-7, FN NSAM 165, 1; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, NSAM 165, 16 June 1962, "Assignment of Additional Responsibility to the Special Group (CI)," NSF, NSAM, Box 336-7, FN NSAM 165, 1; and L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair, JCS) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, JCSM 530-62, 30 Jan. 1962, "Military Training Related to Counter-Insurgency Matters (U)," Attachment, 8 Feb. 1962, "Training Objective to Combat Subversive Insurgency," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 124, 2. Kennedy Presidential Library.

Communist line" since 1954. Unfortunately, the primary obstacle to that desired progress was the Guatemalan military, the Central American nation's primary – and very effective -- internal security force. But the "Guatemalan Government and its army had been faced since November 13, 1960 with a number of coup efforts which have involved defecting military elements and guerrilla type activities." "Counter-guerrilla instruction given to Guatemalan officers by a United States mobile team" had enhanced the ability of the military to defend itself. Complicating matters further was the desire of the Guatemalan Air Force for jet aircraft. The air force reckoned this would assist their internal security mission as it would enable them to bomb the army and thereby "maintain the government." George Ball echoed the staff of the American Republics desk, as well as the general sentiment of the Joint Chiefs, when he opposed this plan. Still, continued political instability threatened to engage the rural populace and university students, where Communist influence, albeit definitely limited, was growing. The Special Group (CI) believed that the answer lay in the expansion and, it was hoped, professionalism of the civil police authorities and a concerted civic action program by all internal security forces. The Inter-American Police Academy, a prized child of the Special Group, was deemed especially efficacious in this process. To assist the continued development of the military's counter-insurgency capabilities, the Internal Defense Plan called for training Guatemalan officers "54 in the United States and 87 in the Canal Zone" in such areas as "infantry officer training, cadet training . . . air-bourne operations, intelligence,

psychological warfare, and communications and training in connection with Civic Action Program."[149]

The Special Group (CI) strongly promoted civic action programs as the best means to induce popular support of internal security forces and programs. The members placed great store in the "potentialities for the development of medical, public health, and sanitation" in particular. In early 1963, the Special Group sought, and received, status reports on the health care programs then underway. In Latin America, embassies reported that many opportunities existed, but that little action had yet been taken. In Argentina, "military medical equipment . . . could be put to excellent use in the outlying areas" and in Costa Rica "the paramilitary forces would be most useful in such a program." Staff in Ecuador reported that "current health and medical activities by police, paramilitary and military units appear to be minimal." The assessment from Bolivia was even more bleak. "For practical purposes there are no substantial health and medical activities by police, carabineros, and military units in Bolivia at present." Of course, the embassy in Bolivia went on to point out that the army itself possessed only rudimentary

---

[149] Thomas W. Davis (Executive Secretary), memorandum, 20 Sept. 1962, "Minutes of Meeting of Special Group (CI)," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 1, FN Special Group (CI) 8/1/62-10/31/62, 1; Charles Maechling (U/S Office Sec. Spec. Group (CI)) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 28 Nov. 1962, "Guatemala Country Internal Defense Plan," Attachment, "Country Internal Defense Plan for Guatemala," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 1, FN Special Group (CI) 8/1/62-10/31/62, 1-30; George Ball (U/S) to Jeffery C. Kitchen (G/PM), memorandum, 29 Nov. 1962, "Agenda for Special Group (CI) Meeting, November 19, 1962," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 1, FN Special Group (CI) 8/1/62-10/31/62, 1; Maechling to Special Group (CI), "Guatemala," Attachment, "Country Internal Defense Plan," 1; ibid., 7; Ball to Kitchen, "Special Group (CI) Meeting, November 19, 1962," 1; Maechling to Special Group (CI), "Guatemala," Attachment, "Country Internal Defense Plan," 15-24. NARA II; ibid., 26; and ibid., 29.

health care facilities and that soldiers received only cursory care at infrequent intervals. While the embassy in Mexico denied the need for any "MAP or AID" assistance, staff in Nicaragua feared any "identification" with the "military establishment," even in such a humanitarian program, was "highly inadvisable" until after the 1963 election. Still, the Special Group (CI) continued to insist that public health and sanitation programs offered an excellent, perhaps the best and most tangible, way internal security forces could foster good will among the populace.[150]

Despite these successes, the President's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, found the U.S. military's efforts to train its Latin American counterparts in counterinsurgency to be lacking. As part of its continual process of assessment, the State Department briefed the Special Group in early 1963 on the "potential trouble spots in Latin America." Edwin M. Martin, the assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, "described several countries as moving into a period of increasing tensions, as they approach election periods, and diverse interests begin jockeying for power." The President's Special Assistant, Ralph Dungan, noted the disturbing persistence in the Military Assistance Program for the "continuing large expenditure of funds for traditional types of military assistance rather than for the desired emphasis on internal security." In

---

[150] U. Alexis Johnson (U/POL) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 16 July 1963, "Medical Civic Action Survey," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 1/17/63-3/7/63, 1; U. Alexis Johnson (U/POL) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 16 July 1963, "Medical Civic Action Survey," Attachment, "Medical Activities by Security Forces," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 1/17/63-3/7/63, 1-13; ibid., 1; and ibid., 2.

other words, the Latin American military wanted toys, "naval vessels, advanced electronic equipment, and modern aircraft." For the attorney general, this trend could in part be explained by the failure of military missions who were "not giving sufficient emphasis in Latin America to counterinsurgency training." Robert Kennedy told his fellow Special Group members that, "during his recent visit to Fort Gulick [January 1963], he was concerned to find that of the 435 Latin American students who have taken courses, only 17 have taken the counterinsurgency course." He therefore instructed the Defense Department representative on the Special Group (CI), General Krulak, "to review the situation and submit a report."[151]

It took the Joint Chiefs of Staff some time to satisfy the attorney general. It was not until mid-June that General Taylor, now the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "agreed to submit a report at the June 17, 1963, meeting." It was not until June 28 that the general offered his considered thoughts that the military facilities stood ready to provide counter-insurgency training across the globe. The Joint Chiefs provided the Special Group (CI) with a detailed memorandum that outlined U.S. military counterinsurgency activities, including the location of the specific training facilities listing which armed service branch provided the training. None of the facilities in the Canal Zone rated a mention. General Taylor neatly sidestepped the attorney general's criticism when he contended that "there are no unfilled requests for foreign officers to

[151] Thomas W. Davis (Exec. Sec. Spec. Group (CI)), memorandum, 4 Jan. 1963, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Special Group (CI)," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 1/17/63-3/7/63, 1-2. NARA II.

receive counter-insurgency training in U.S. military schools." The attorney general then requested a detailed report on the content of the military counterinsurgency courses. "The Group noted with interest the display of military counterinsurgency training material" that General Krulak provided on July 12 in partial fulfillment of Robert Kennedy's latest request. When the Defense Department in late August 1963 finally produced the document requested at the beginning of the year, it once again stressed the variety of operations it was conducting around the globe, including its intensive country operations in Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Guatemala. When it turned to the Canal Zone, the report lauded the cooperation given by the U.S. Army Southern Command to the Inter-American Police Academy, that command's support of army mobile training teams, and the "stockpile of standard riot control equipment" from which the Commander in Chief of U.S. Army forces in Panama sent material to help quell "emergency situations [in] Ecuador and Bolivia." The U.S. Army School of the Americas at Ft. Gulick remained conspicuously absent.[152]

---

[152] James W. Dingeman (Exec. Sec. Spec. Group (CI)), memorandum, 17 June 1963, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Special Group (CI)," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 6/20/63 – 8/1/63, 2-3. NARA II; Maj. Gen. A. J. Goodpaster (Spec. Asst. to Chair/JCS) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 25 June 1963, "Summary of Military Counterinsurgency Progress Including Civic Action Since 27 Dec. 1962 (U)," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 6/20/63-8/1/63, 1-4; James W. Dingeman (Exec Sec. Spec. Group (CI)), memorandum, 28 June 1963, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Special Group (CI)," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 6/20/63-8/1/63, 3; Charles Maechling (U/S Office Sec. Spec. Group (CI)) to U. Alexis Johnson (U/POL), memorandum, 11 July 1963, "Agenda for Special Group (Counter Insurgency) Meeting, July 11, 1963," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 6/20/63-8/1/63, 4; George A. Carroll (ASD/Spec. Ops.) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 21 Aug. 1963, "Department of Defense Report on Developments in Counterinsurgency," Inclosure, "Department of Defense Report on Developments in Counterinsurgency,"

Latin America ultimately occupied only a small portion of the Special Group's time and effort in 1963. The Special Group no longer viewed Latin America with the same urgency. Of course, the Group remained sensitive to changing circumstances, such as when the "Communist-led para-military FALN [Armed Forces of National Liberations] in 1963 . . . staged limited but spectacular acts of sabotage and terrorism against a wide range of targets, demonstrating an increasing degree of sophistication, discipline and boldness." The Special Group set up weekly meetings in late September 1963 to coordinate the U.S. response to this seemingly well-organized insurgency in Venezuela, and it renewed its interest in the original five countries picked by President Kennedy for special attention: Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Guatemala. But by December, the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs reported to the Special Group that "in Guatemala and Ecuador the would-be instigators of terrorism appear to be weak . . . and the military regimes in these countries are ready to take repressive action." The report added that the "civilian governments of Venezuela, Bolivia, and Colombia have broadly-based support, and opposition has generally been limited to activities that can be controlled by the security forces." Any threat of "terrorism," the Bureau argued, "is present in Latin America on a significant scale only in Venezuela." To that the Bureau reported with confidence that the "Betancourt government is successfully keeping urban terrorism and rural insurgency within manageable limits while improving its internal security capabilities." Despite the manifest support of the Cuban Government for the

---

RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 8/8/63-10/31/63, 4-5. NARA II.

FALN, "a three-ton arms cache [was] discovered on a northern beach was found to be of Cuban origin," Venezuela benefited from U.S. AID and MAP assistance, and from the 182 Venezuelan officers who had trained at the "U.S. Army School, Canal Zone since January 1961." By August 1963, only Honduras remained on the list of countries for which a quarterly internal defense report was required, since the Special Group had implemented Internal Defense Plans for the other five Latin American nations – Guatemala, Colombia, Venezuela, Bolivia, and Ecuador.[153]

**CONCLUSION**

President John F. Kennedy assumed office convinced that the United States needed to fundamentally alter its defense posture. "Massive retaliation" had to give way to "flexible response" in order to contain the growing Soviet threat to the third world. Rising expectations left the peoples of the so-called "underdeveloped" nations ripe for Communist subversion, and the United States, Kennedy believed, needed to enhance greatly its ability to counter this new gambit of international Communism. Cuba proved

---

[153] Martin (ARA) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 18 Sept. 1963, "FALN Attacks Against Official U.S. Installations and Personnel in Venezuela," Enclosure, "FALN Attacks Against Official U.S. Installations and Personnel in Venezuela," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 8/8/63-10/31/63, 1; Charles Maeschling (Sec. Spec. Group (CI)) to Averell Harriman (Chair, Special Group (CI)), memorandum, 19 Dec. 1963, "Agenda for Special Group (Counter-Insurgency) Meeting," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 10/17-12/19/63, 1; Sterling J. Cotrell (ARA) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 17 Dec. 1963, "Terrorism in the Latin American Countries on the Critical Insurgency List," 1; Cotrell to Special Group (CI), "Terrorism in the Latin American Countries," Attachment, "Country Paper: Terrorism in Venezuela," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 3, FN Special Group (CI) 10/17-12/19/63, 3; ibid., 2; ibid., 5; and James W. Dingman (Exec. Sec., Spec. Group (CI)), memorandum, 12 Aug. 1963, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Special Group (CI)," RG 59 Records of the

the necessity of this. The foundation of regional strategy under the Eisenhower administration – hemispheric defense – had failed to keep the Communists from establishing a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere. But the threat of the Cuban Revolution lay not in its success but in Castro's potential to foment insurrection throughout the region. And, in no small way, Castro represented a personal challenge to the hemispheric authority of the new president. In response, Kennedy sought to create the institutional infrastructure he deemed necessary to confront Soviet expansion. The Alliance for Progress would, he hoped, stimulate economic development in the region while counterinsurgency training would provide the internal security needed to protect the nascent economies during this liminal period. Bureaucratic impediments, however, frustrated the young president. Kennedy struggled to swiftly implement his new programs and found himself repeating his instructions year after year. The Joint Chiefs agreed with the need for a systemic overhaul and embarked on a thorough reorientation toward rapid deployment and response, with counterinsurgency the preferred preventative. The U.S. armed services, however, seemed bent on developing its new capabilities on its own schedule. As 1961 gave way to 1962, the initial urgency with which the Kennedy administration viewed the Cuban threat shifted to Moscow, Berlin, and Laos. By the fall of 1962, the Cuban threat took on a far greater dimension.

Kennedy did not give up much in consenting to stay an invasion of Cuba following the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. The compromise included the

---

Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 8/8/63-10/31/63, 2. NARA II.

decommissioning of outdated American nuclear missiles poised to strike the Soviet Union from launch pads in northeastern Turkey. The events of that October proved that the Soviet Union was the true enemy of the United States, and the Special Group (CI) had determined that despite the example set by Castro, his ability to project his revolution outside of Cuba had proved limited. The Defense Department had no illusions about the inconsistent and often woefully inadequate training and material present in many Latin American nations, especially in Central America and in the Caribbean, but they believed that training by the United States could quickly set right the less-equipped of the region's militaries. The Kennedy administration gradually accepted that the Latin American military could provide the front line defense against Communist subversion in the region with proper supervision and education. The strategy fit with the formula of modernization, followed the recommendation of Defense Department staffers, and allowed Kennedy and his administration to focus on the growing threat in Southeast Asia. The heavy burden of nation building had spread rapidly beyond the Western Hemisphere. With the instruments at hand – the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and the Special Forces – Kennedy now could see to the security of the region, by providing the region's most reliable institution – the military – with the tools it needed to protect their peoples' nations while encountering force-fed development.

John F. Kennedy also perpetuated the historic paternalism of the United States toward Latin America. He entered the White House on a wave of optimism and high ambition. He surrounded himself with bright, exceptionally well-educated men characterized by their relative youth and a brazen confidence. These men found in the

remarkable example of the United States the strength for an unshakable conviction that American know-how could identify, analyze, and solve the complex problems the United States faced which, in their minds, the preceding administration had blithely ignored. Yet the reductionist nature of that belief, and the perceptions that fostered it, came about as a result of the traditional manner in which the United States treated non-white peoples. Policymakers in the United States drew upon race ideology when they consistently characterized political opposition to Latin American governments as solely the work of Cuban subversion, itself merely an extension of aggressive, expansive, world Communism, i.e. externally driven, supplied, and orchestrated. Kennedy and his staff, with rare exception, sought to eliminate the legitimacy of political opposition in Latin America in much the same manner as segregationists in the South did when they verbally attacked civil rights workers of the same period as "outside agitators."[154]

The president, Rostow, et al., applied the same logic to social protest in Latin America. They were not ignorant of the inequities of life in the region and the disproportionate power wielded by Latin American elites that nurtured those inequalities. They had relied on those very elites for some time, and would continue to do so in the battle against world Communism. But it was resistance to those elites that comprised the impetus and animus of a host of insurgent movements in the 1960s and beyond. Communism may have been the language of many revolutionary movements and their erstwhile leaders, but not all of them. Moreover, the dizzying manner in which

[154] Eqbal Ahmad, "The Roots of Misconceptions," in No More Vietnams? The War and the Future of American Foreign Policy, ed. Richard M. Pfeffer (New York: Harper/Colophon, 1968), 17.

Communism, Marxism, Leninism, Socialism, and even democracy splintered across Latin America demonstrated that the motivations of the people who joined movements, lauded in quiet or public were as variegated as the individuals themselves. And only a desperate few actually took up arms. But to U.S. policymakers, those human beings were "leftist insurgents," "Communist rebels," or Marxist guerrillas," willing victims of a malignancy, and pawns to world Communism.

# Chapter 4:

## "What's in a Name?"

## The U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1959-1963

Walt W. Rostow warned the first graduating class of the Special Warfare School on June 28, 1961, that "it does not take much imagination to understand why President Kennedy has taken the problem of guerrilla warfare seriously." The facility at Ft. Bragg, North Carolina would become the clearinghouse for counterinsurgency training tactics in President Kennedy's battle against Communist guerilla action around the globe. In his remarks to the soldiers, Rostow, the new chief of the Department of State's Policy Planning Staff, intoned that the new administration "faced four major crises: Cuba, the Congo, Laos, and Viet-Nam." "Each," Rostow warned the graduates, "represented a successful Communist breaching . . . of the Cold War truce lines" that had evolved after World War II. Recent Communist aggression had proven especially dangerous to the Western Hemisphere. "The Cuban Revolution," he went on, had been "tragically captured from within by the Communist apparatus." For Rostow, that meant that "Latin America faces the danger of Cuba's being used as the base for training, supply, and direction of guerrilla warfare in the Hemisphere." The prospect of Cuban-sponsored subversion loomed large in the region, given Rostow's fear of the destabilizing impact of "the revolution of modernization." While the Communists worked to subvert this process and impose Communist dictatorships as they had with Cuba, Rostow argued that the "American purpose and the American strategy" instead sought to promote "increasing

degrees of human freedom" in which "truly independent nations" would be "permitted to fashion, out of its own culture and its own ambitions, the kind of modern society it wants." "Our central task in the underdeveloped areas," Rostow admonished the graduates, "is to protect the independence of the revolutionary process now going forward."[155]

John F. Kennedy called Latin America the "most dangerous area in the world." The Cuban Revolution reflected a worldwide rise in dissident insurgencies that represented a new assault by Moscow on the free world, which now threatened the United States in the Western Hemisphere. The events of 1959 led to incremental adjustments to the mechanics of hemispheric defense. Kennedy came to office in 1961 convinced that the defense posture of the United States required a complete overhaul to meet this new threat. And when Fidel Castro declared on May 1, 1961, that Cuba was a socialist state and he would not hold any elections, it became obvious that his "barely tolerated" forays into the Caribbean had to be stopped. Rampant poverty, deeply rooted antagonisms, and a revolution of "rising expectations" threatened to tear apart the underdeveloped world.[156]

---

[155] Walt W. Rostow to U.S. Army Special Warfare School, address, 28 June 1961, "Guerrilla Warfare in Underdeveloped Areas," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Records of the Policy Planning Staff, 1957-1961, Box 121, FN Internal Defense – Counter Guerrilla, 1. NARA II; ibid., 2; and ibid., 3.

[156] See Stephen G. Rabe, The Most Dangerous Area of the World: John F. Kennedy Confronts Communist Revolution in Latin America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); and Edwin Lieuwen, Arms and Politics in Latin America, rev. ed. (New York: Praeger, 1961), 286.

Walt Rostow had supreme confidence in the ability of United States expertise to control the modernization process. Further, he staked America to the likelihood that modernization would produce capitalist democracies. Like his president, he feared Communist subversion like the plague. Internal security training held the cure. Thus, to the United States fell a thankless task. "I do not need to tell you," Rostow intoned, "that the primary responsibility for dealing with guerrilla warfare in the underdeveloped areas cannot be America." Instead, the United States must arm the men who would battle Communist subversion by providing them with the skills necessary to keep their nations free. Training Latin American military students, who could then go home and train their comrades, was what the good doctor from MIT prescribed. He concluded to the graduates that, like doctors inoculating a population against a dread contagion, the United States must counter "the systematic attempt by Communists to impose a serious disease on those societies attempting the transition to modernization." Latin America would have to provide its own internal security in this ongoing battle, with U.S. direction and training, of course.[157]

The army initially viewed the USARCARIB School at Ft. Gulick as the best available resource to reorient the Latin American military to internal security. For two decades the United States had used the Panama Canal Zone to train members of the Latin American military, first during World War II and then as part of a hemispheric defense posture. While Latin America pushed the USARCARIB School to increase its offerings

[157] Rostow to U.S. Army Special Warfare School, "Guerrilla Warfare in Underdeveloped Areas," 1. NARA II.

and raise the sophistication of its courses, the school had operated in obscurity within the training regimen of the U.S. Army. The school had to negotiate any changes carefully within established doctrine. Now, the language skills possessed by its instructors seemed to provide the quickest route to instilling in the Latin American military the tenets of United States counterinsurgency training.

But the Kennedy administration never embraced the U.S. Army training center in Panama. When Kennedy renamed the facility at Ft. Gulick the U.S. Army School of the Americas in July 1963, the change came as part of a promotional campaign to show that the United States military had embraced a truly hemispheric perspective. The school had quickly become a minor footnote in a systemic shift to counterinsurgency training. Instead, President Kennedy preferred the poster children of his new policy: special forces. Not only did the new special forces units represent a mobile, surgical strike capability to meet the new challenge posed by international Communism in the guise of wars of national liberation, these new cadres would provide the requisite training to the military of the underdeveloped world. And by the end of the young president's tenure, the region no longer held the president's interest, nor did Latin America represent the threat it had initially seemed to pose.[158]

---

[158] JCS, General Order No. 8, 1 July 1963, "Redesignation of Unit," in Col. Harry D. Temple (USARSO) to Commandant, USARSA, letter, 13 Sep. 1963, Distinctive Insignia Request, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1-2. CMH.

## INTERNAL SECURITY

Military men shaped U.S.-Latin American relations during the cold war. By the time Harry Truman signed the military assistance pact into law, the United States had superceded Europe as the primary source of military expertise in the hemisphere. Policymakers for successive U.S. administrations correctly identified the military of Latin America as the most important power brokers in their society and concentrated on them accordingly. But this developing relationship was fraught with antagonism. At best, the United States doled out material aid according to schedules set in Washington, D.C. Even in Brazil, where the United States forged the closest relationship with any military in Latin America, U.S. military officers abruptly informed Brazilian military leaders in April 1957 that they could not enter the Nike missile bases constructed on their territory. Instead, they could serve as weather observers, security guards, or housekeepers. As prestigious and powerful – often preeminent – leaders of sovereign nations, Latin American military keenly resented their secondary status. The military of Latin America likened themselves to the noble military orders of the distant past, honor bound to defend their homeland and above the fray of pedestrian political affairs. Confronted with what they perceived as a pervasive venality that ran rampant in national and regional politics, the Latin American military by the eve of the Cuban Revolution had led for decades with the entrenched conviction that only they were fit to protect the fatherland. Periodically, corrupt politics and inept politicians compelled the military to intervene on behalf of the nation. Or, as Argentina's General Arturo Rawson explained his country's second coup of 1943, "When the nation, as a result of bad rulers, is put into a situation where there are

no constitutional solutions, [the military] has a duty to fulfill: to put the nation in order." And they must have had a lot of "bad rulers," because the Latin American military launched no fewer than ninety-seven coups between 1930 and 1961. But the United States cared more about Communism than democracy during the cold war. And while critics of internal security assistance for Latin American military persistently decried the use of such training for domestic political repression, the Kennedy administration believed that only with U.S. military training could Latin America forestall further Communist subversion in the hemisphere.[159]

Internal security was precisely the type of training that Latin America wanted. Brazilians had already touted the training offered by the U.S. Army Caribbean School. In May 1959, the American consul in São Paulo sent a dispatch to Washington in which he cited an article in a local São Paulo paper that described a new course being offered at the

---

[159] See John Child, Unequal Alliance: The Inter-American Military System, 1938-1978 (Boulder: Westview, 1980), 27-46; and Lieuwen, Arms and Politics, 187-95 for U.S. military training up through World War II. Brian Loveman, For La Patria: Politics and the Armed Forces in Latin America (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1999), 149-55; and Child, Unequal Alliance, 119-29 discuss the emerging cold war U.S. policy toward the Latin American military. Sonny B. Davis, Brotherhood of Arms: Brazil-U.S. Military Relations, 1945-1977 (Niwot, CO: University Press of Colorado, 1996), 154. Loveman, La Patria, 101-38; Lieuwen, Arms and Politics, 24-8; and John J. Johnson, The Military and Society in Latin America (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), 93-133, trace the development of the institutional fervor of the Latin American military. For the catalytic role of the Cuban Revolution, see Brian Loveman and Thomas M. Davies, Jr., eds., The Politics of Antipolitics: The Military in Latin America, 2d rev. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), 89-93, 163-5, and see "The Military Speaks for Itself," in Loveman and Davies, eds., Politics of Antipolitics, 193-306, for a thorough sampling of the collective anti-political mindset. For more details see Lieuwen, Arms and Politics, 36-58, and Johnson, Military and Society, 134-52. Loveman, La Patria, 101, quotes General Arturo Rawson; Willard Barber and C. Neale Ronning, Internal Security and Military Power: Counterinsurgency and Civic Action in Latin America (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1966), Appendix A, "Illegal and Unscheduled Changes of Heads of State," Part I, "By Country," [1-15]; and See David F. Schmitz, Thank God They're on Our Side: The United States and Right-Wing Dictatorships, 1921-1965 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), for a global look at the predilection for authoritarian dictatorships.

local Police Force Training School by officers who had graduated from Fort Gulick, site of the USARCARIB School." The article lauded the efforts of the Commandant of the Forca Pública, a paramilitary group stationed in São Paulo, who established a "specialized course under the direction of the officers who studied at the USARCARIB School" to establish a "shock squad." The paper described this "shock squad" as one "equipped to handle all abnormal situations," such as a "public disturbance." "In the event of a public disturbance," the article stated with pride, "the military intelligence service will inform the High Command of the Forca Pública," which in turn "will dispatch a detachment . . . outfitted with the most modern equipment: carbines with bayonets, gas masks, moral effect and chemical grenades." The United States consulate in São Paulo wrote that "this information will be of interest to the Department and other Washington agencies as evidence of the effectiveness of technical assistance and training offers extended by the American Government to military and police organizations in Brazil." The open reality was that Latin Americans utilized the training given by the U.S. military for domestic purposes. No mission held greater prominence for the Latin American military than the preservation of the nation state from the ravages of Communism. And they wanted the best the United States had to offer.[160]

The USARCARIB School in 1959, however, still had to operate from its fringe position in the U.S. hemispheric defense posture. The school continued to fall under the

---

[160] Richard P. Butrick (São Paulo) to Department of State, dispatch, #570, 11 May 1959, "Forca Pública Training School," Enclosure 2, "Translation of an Article Appearing in a Gazeta, May 6, 1959," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Decimal Files, 1955-1959, Box 2950, FN 711C.11/12-1456, 1-2. NARA II. And see note 4 above.

rubric of the U.S. Caribbean Command, whose duties included the "principal U.S. military representative in military/political negotiations and dealings between the U.S. and Latin American countries."[161] The mission of the USARCARIB School was limited to:

> a. support U.S. Army Missions, Attaches, MAAGs, and Commissions operating in Latin America by instructing Latin American Military and para-military personnel in U.S. military technical skills, leadership techniques, and doctrine covering military actions during peace and war;
> b. augment the efforts of other U.S. agencies in fostering friendly relations with Latin American nations;
> c. instill in Latin American personnel a further appreciation of the ideals of democracy and the American way of life; and
> d. translate selected training publications from English into Spanish.[162]

Students concentrated in "courses in the school's three major departments: Tactics, Armament and Automotive, and Technical." But, in April 1959, Walter H. Dustmann, from the U.S. embassy in Panama, celebrated "a 'first' in hemispheric military cooperation" when students at the USARCARIB School "participated in the firing of 105 mm howitzers with U.S. Army troops." The course of instruction at the school and the test firing followed the dictates of the training offered at the "Artillery School, Ft. Sill, Oklahoma." Prior to this joint exercise, "students took this type of training only with the

---

[161] Hugh Gardner, USARSO, "Mission of Southern Command, 1959-1966," HMF 2-021, 1. CMH.

[162] J. F. Monahan to (Col. Schroeder) Commandant, letter, 15 Jan. 1963, "Operational Analysis Report, USARCARIB School," RG 498 U.S. Army Caribbean School [School of the Americas], Box 1, File No. 201-46, Operations Planning Files, CY 1962. NARA II.

school's Armament section." In this historic "first" were "Latin American students from nine Central and South American countries."[163]

The Eisenhower administration adjusted its attitude about intelligence training after Castro's successful revolution in Cuba. Although the president rejected intelligence training for Latin American military at the USARCARIB School in 1956, continued demand for training from Latin America, particularly Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and Guatemala, combined with the perceived growing "Communist attention to Latin America," led the army to push for greater latitude to impart specialized training. In January 1959, the United States Intelligence Board began to debate the utility of establishing a counterintelligence school in Panama because "the Army had received many indications of interest on the part of various Latin American armed forces officers in training in counterintelligence and countersubversive methods." Administratively, the State Department wanted the Operations Control Board to coordinate any such training program on a case-by-case basis. Eisenhower resisted the bureaucratic tendency to proliferate, so he was reluctant to create any new entities, especially with the defense establishment. Permanent training at the USARCARIB School would permit administrative coordination of counterintelligence training. The Department of State and Defense would identify nations in need of such training; military missions could then participate in the selection of specific students to be sent to Ft. Gulick. In May 1960,

---

[163] Walter H. Dustmann (First Sec., Panama Embassy) to Department of State, dispatch, #543, 16 Apr. 1959, "Army Caribbean LA Students in Hemispheric 'First'," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Decimal Files, 1955-1959, Box 2950, FN 711C.11/12-1456, 1. NARA II.

President Eisenhower authorized the establishment of a "special school for intelligence and anti-subversion orientation in Panama." Instead of a separate facility, the army eventually instituted intelligence training as a regular part of the curriculum at the USARCARIB School in October 1960. The counterintelligence training at the school and the establishment of the Foreign Area Specialist training program for Latin America did represent a small shift in the practice of hemispheric defense and came as a result of the Cuban Revolution.[164]

Nevertheless, the mechanics of United States defense posture under Eisenhower still limited Latin America's role in the cold war to hemispheric defense with only the appearance of a collaborative effort. The Inter-American Army Conference 1960 sought "to promote Inter-American friendships on both a personal and country-to-country-basis" by providing "conferees unclassified information" on international Communism's

---

[164] Snow (ARA) to Arneson (INR), memorandum, 27 Feb. 1959, "Counterintelligence School for Latin American Armed Forces Officers," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Records of the Special Assistant on Communism, 1958-1962, Box 2, FN Intelligence 1959, 1; Department of State to Bogotá, et al., instruction, #CA-10336, 28 May 1959, "Department of the Army Foreign Area Specialist Training Program for Latin America," Enclosure, Richard Collins (Dir., Plans, Prog., and Sec., OUSACOS) to Chief, Mil. Liaison, DOS, memorandum, 4 May 1959, "Department of the Army Foreign Area Specialist Training Program for Latin America," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Decimal File, 1955-1959, Box 3068, FN 710.5/3-2759, 1; Hugh S. Cumming (INR) to Murphy, letter, 20 Jan. 1960, "Counterintelligence School for Latin American Armed Forces Officers," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Records of the Special Assistant on Communism, 1958-1962, Box 2, FN Intelligence 1959, 1; Snow to Arneson, "Counterintelligence School," 1; Herb Higgins (MSC) to John O. Bell (U/MSC), memorandum, 16 May 1960, "Interim Spot Report," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Office of the Deputy Director of Program and Planning (Special Assistant for Mutual Security Coordination), Office Files of John O. Bell, 1957-1961, Box 17, FN JMW – Latin America, 1-3; and Elvis Stahr (Sec. of the Army) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, JCSM 173-60, 27 April 1961, "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," Inclusion 4 "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," in Annex B "Intelligence," RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Admin. Files, 1955-1962, 1961 Cases, Box 436, FN AG 353, 1-6-61, 1. NARA II.

"objectives in the Western Hemisphere" along with the available "intelligence training under MAP and OISP." The year 1959 did lead to subtle adjustments in practice but not policy. For example, the responsibilities of the Caribbean Command did increase to include Mexico in 1960. The Inter-American Army Conference 1960 sought "to promote Inter-American friendships on both a personal and country-to-country-basis" by providing "conferees unclassified information" on international Communism's "objectives in the Western Hemisphere" along with the available "intelligence training under MAP and OISP." And while momentum for the creation of the Inter-American Defense College grew in 1959, the proposed institution still fell clearly within the parameters of established policy. The new College would have the "mission of conducting a course of study on the Inter-American system and the military, economic, political and social factors that constitute the essential components of inter-American defense," enabling Latin American attendees the opportunity to "be exposed to our national environment and acquire a better understanding of our institutions and way of life." And, of course, the IADC would help to "increase [Latin American armed forces'] understanding of, and orientation toward, U.S. objectives and policies, and to promote democratic concepts and foster pro-American sentiments among Latin American military personnel." Still, it would take three more years before the United States funded the original Inter-American Defense College, first located at Ft. McNair in Washington, D.C., and later at Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas. But it was left to a Panama City newspaper to praise the Latin American representatives graduated in June 1959 by the USARCARIB School as further proof of the bonds forged by the school, heralding that "There is no

nation in our Americas that has not shed the blood of its people for that greatest boon of all: freedom . . . we of these 21 free nations must ever stand together against any foreign foe."[165]

**WHERE POLICY MEETS CURRICULA**

Little changed in the actual practice of American military policy toward Latin America in the opening months of 1961. Despite the new young president's public rhetoric about the importance of Latin America to regional security, United States military representatives found a cool reception from Latin American military attendees at the March 1961 Operation Solidarity conference at Ft. Amador, Panama. Latin American representatives wanted more aid, requested U.S. officers who could speak Spanish, and found that the year's meeting offered "'nothing new'." Regarding Castro, the Latin American response varied. Argentina "visibly avoided the subject" and noted only that such a revolution "could not happen in Argentina," while General Gomar of Mexico

---

[165] Maj. Gen. Daniel A. O'Conner (COSCARIBCOM), memorandum, 19 July 1960, "Inter-American Army Conference," RG 218 Records of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Central Decimal File, 1960, Box 73, FN CCS 9122-5410 Central America (19 July 1960), 1. NARA II; Hugh Gardner, USARSO, "Mission of Southern Command, 1959-1966," HMF 2-021, 1. CMH; O'Conner (COSCARIBCOM), "Inter-American Army Conference," 1; Christian A. Herter (Acting Sec. of State) to American Republics, circular telegram, #G-11, 6 July 1959, RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Decimal File, 1955-1959, Box 3068, FN 710.5/3-2759, 1; R. R. Rubottom (A/ARA) to Robert K. Knight (Dep. ASD/ISA), letter, 6 Nov. 1959, RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Decimal File, 1955-1959, Box 3068, FN 710.5/3-2759, 1; J-5 to JCS, note, 2 Apr. 1959, "An Inter-American Defense College," Enclosure 'E', "Discussion," RG 218 Records of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Central Decimal File, 1959, Box 128, FN CCS 9122-3520 Central America (14 Apr. 1959); W. A. Comer (Military Assistance Comptroller) to Chief Military Assistance Division (Dept. of the Army), 25 Apr. 1962, "Furnishings for the IADC," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 49, FN 352 Apr-June, 1962, 1-3; and in "For All-American Defense," Star and Herald, in Walter H. Dustmann (First Sec., Panama Embassy) to Department of State, dispatch, #676, 10 June 1959, "Army Caribbean School Graduates 338 Latin Americans," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Decimal Files, 1955-1959, Box 2950, FN 711C.11/12-1456, 1. NARA II.

stated categorically that "'if those Cubans try to impress themselves on Mexico we will kill them'." The representatives from the Southern Cone generally dismissed Castro as a threat only to "illiterates." Guatemala, on the other hand, welcomed U.S. military intervention. Designed as a "training exercise," Operation Solidarity reflected the type of cooperative efforts that characterized the Eisenhower administration: high-level meetings and discussions with a modicum of fanfare, generally in less-than glamorous settings, that offered Latin Americans few opportunities for any substantive input into policy or material improvements of aid. The final report generated by the Caribbean Command did include a country-by-country assessment of each Latin American state's combat readiness based on its ability to preserve internal security. Brazil and Mexico, along with Chile, fared relatively well in the eyes of the U.S. military, but the Andean nations posed a cause for concern and the islands of the Caribbean and Central America represented serious potential targets for Communist infiltration.[166]

The Bay of Pigs debacle on April 17, 1961 forced the United States to accelerate, rapidly, the drive to provide Latin America with the skills to defend themselves from Cuban-Communist subversion. The National Security Council met on April 22, 1961, to re-evaluate U.S. policy. In response to those "discussions," Robert McNamara directed the secretary of the army, Elvis Stahr, to provide, post haste, a "plan . . . for stepping up

---

[166] CGUSARCARIB (Ft. Amador) to DCSOPS (Washington), telegram (CARGB 40094), 8 Mar. 1961, "Summary of Comments and Reaction Latin American Military Representatives to Operation Solidarity," POF, Country File, Box 121A, FN Latin America, Security, 1961-1963, 1-3. Kennedy Presidential Library; "Operation Solidarity," 1-4 March 1961, Final Report, HRC 354.2 Maneuvers- Operation Solidarity, 1. For individual country reports, see Annexes A through S of "Operation Solidarity," 1-4 March 1961, Final Report, HRC 354.2 Maneuvers- Operation Solidarity, 1. CMH.

Latin American attendance in counter-guerrilla training activities, notably those at Fort Bragg and Fort Gulick." The army concluded that the United States needed to expand counterinsurgency training because "most Latin American MAAGs and missions who advise local governments do not have personnel qualified in counter-insurgency, counter-intelligence, civic action, and psychological warfare." Even more alarming, Secretary Stahr's report went on to say, few "officials" outside of the Latin American military appreciate the threat of Communist subversion or "for internal reasons ignore the importance of counter-insurgency, civic action, intelligence/security, and psychological operations." The Joint Chiefs of Staff quickly concurred and authorized the expansion of counterintelligence training beyond the USARCARIB School to include the U.S. Army Intelligence School, the Inter-American Defense Board, the Foreign Area Specialist School, and all service schools and colleges that trained MAAGS, missions, and attachés. The secretary's staff targeted Colombia, specifically, for training given the already identified "threat" of subversion there. Ideally, expanded U.S. military training would enable "local governments" throughout the region to "gradually develop their own capability for counter-guerrilla training." "The prime mission" of the facilities at Ft. Bragg and Ft. Gulick, Secretary Stahr went on, were "to develop cadres, capable of conducting similar courses in their own countries."[167]

---

[167] Robert McNamara (Sec. of Defense) to Elvis Stahr (Sec. of Army), memorandum, 22 Apr. 1961, 1; Stahr to McNamara, memorandum, "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in," Inclusion #4, "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance," 2; idem, "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," Inclusion 4, to "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," 3; "Intelligence," Annex B in "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," Inclusion 4, in idem, "Plan to Step Up Latin

The Kennedy administration chose courses at the USARCARIB School and at Ft. Bragg to spearhead the new assault on subversion in Latin America. A select group of advisors – likely members of the Special Group (CI) – including General Maxwell Taylor, Allan Dulles, and Robert Kennedy, met at the direction of the president on May 16, 1961 to review the "capability, estimated effectiveness, and status" of the region's police and military to stem guerrilla incursions. The Joint Chiefs formally responded to President Kennedy three days later with JCSM 341-61. The leaders of the nation's armed forces concluded that the United States faced a long-term problem developing Latin America's internal security capacity. General L. L. Lemnitzer, the new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, questioned the state of readiness of Latin America's internal security capabilities. The general reported that the domestic security forces extant in most Latin America countries could, when supported by their governments, satisfactorily handle indigenous threats. Subversion, however, was another matter. Countries such as Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico possessed well-established military institutions and internal security apparatuses to quell even external subversion campaigns. But most of the region's military suffered material and educational weaknesses. Further, Lemnitzer contended, "the existing U.S. military program for strengthening the internal security of

---

American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," 1-2; idem, "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," Inclusion #2, "Counter-Insurgency Training Requirement for Colombia," 1-2; idem, "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," 1; and idem, "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," Inclusion #4, "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Admin. Files, 1955-1962, 1961 Cases, Box 436, FN AG 353, 1-6-61, 1-2. NARA II.

Latin America is . . . beyond the present capability of most Latin American nations to absorb." Consequently, the general recommended a two-pronged educational program: one to increase awareness among the public, political leaders, and the armed forces of Latin America that "local Communism is totalitarian inter-national communism," and the second to modernize the region's police and military with counterinsurgency training. But, the general cautioned, this would of necessity be a development program. It would take time.[168]

Properly trained police forces seemed to offer a useful mechanism to stem Communist subversion in Latin America. The United States, the Joint Chiefs told the president in their May report, had already established military police training in Puerto Rico, the United States, and at the USARCARIB School, teaching Latin American cadres such skills as "border patrol, civil defense, riot control, industrial security, and security investigations." "Since 1956," the Joint Chiefs went on, the International Cooperation Agency had trained police representatives from "Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, and Peru" and had recently "recommended initiation of the program in Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rico, [sic] Uruguay, and Venezuela." Proponents saw police as a quick fix. Establishing police forces might circumvent the

[168] General L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair JCS) to President, memorandum, JCSM 341-61, 19 May 1961, "Training of Police and Armed Forces of Latin America (U)," Appendix, "Training of Police and Armed Forces of Latin America (U)," POF, CO, Box 121A, FN Latin America, Security, 1960-63, 1-2; General L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair JCS) to President, memorandum, JCSM 341-61, 19 May 1961, "Training of Police and Armed Forces of Latin America (U)," POF, CO, Box 121A, FN Latin America, Security, 1960-63, 1-2. Kennedy Presidential Library.

Morse amendment as well as provide a viable method of internal security that could quickly be inserted into Latin American politics.[169]

General Lemnitzer and the Joint Chiefs, however, rejected plans to form a "Parisian police" in any Latin American country. "The French police organization," according to the general, enjoys a professionalism and institutional history independent of specific regimes, whereas "in Latin America, police forces are suspect and among the first to be reorganized by the new administration." Plus, the Latin American military would resist any institutional threat to their preeminent position on internal security. In time, perhaps, training programs could develop effective, professional police forces, "with minimal overtones of political connivance," that could assist in maintaining internal security. The Joint Chiefs offered military police training as a compromise and advised President Kennedy that MAP money would pay for "344 spaces at a cost of $253,440 for Riot Control training and 344 spaces at a cost of $199,180 for Counterguerrilla Training at Fort Gulick.[170]

Not surprisingly, the Joint Chiefs recommended military-led counterinsurgency training as the foremost tool to counter Cuban-Communist subversion. The Joint Chiefs advised the president that the U.S. Army planned to launch its new training program on July 31, 1961 at Ft. Gulick in the Canal Zone. Secretary of the Army Elvis Stahr initially promoted the USARCARIB School at Ft. Gulick as the best first choice for

---

[169] Lemnitzer to President, JCSM 341-61, "Training," Appendix, "Training of Police and Armed Forces," 5. Kennedy Presidential Library.

[170] Ibid., 4; ibid., 2.

counterinsurgency training, “rather than Fort Bragg,” because of its Spanish language instruction. The first ten-week “Counter-Resistance Course,” as it initially was called, began with “forty students from eighteen Latin American countries” and included instruction in “civic action, 87 hours; intelligence-counter-intelligence, 91 hours; counterguerrilla tactics and techniques, 95 hours.” The army had actually made the announcement on April 5. The Associated Press reported that the army planned to establish a “special guerrilla and anti-guerrilla warfare school” in the Panama Canal Zone that summer for “Latin American nations which ask [for] such training.” The school sought to enlist Latin American interest at the Second Annual United States-Latin American Army Commanders Conference, held at the Caribbean Command Headquarters at Ft. Amador, in early May 1961. At the meeting, Lt. Col. Felipe Vías, the new counter-resistance section chief at the USARCARIB School, emphasized the importance of teaching the “theories and practices of Communist aggression developed by Soviet Russia and Red China.” “Recent experience in Algeria, Laos, Viet Nam and Cuba” illustrated the “increasing threat to the free world of subversion and guerrilla-type operations.” In an article that touted the new course as the key to U.S. efforts to “Nip New Castros,” The Wall Street Journal in early August extolled the “little-publicized training program” that was “quietly indoctrinating key officers in the varied skills required to crush Red insurgent movements.” The Journal reported that instruction, in keeping with the doctrines of development, stressed civic action. As one Guatemalan

Captain put it, "'we want to further these poor classes which constitute precisely the seed-bed for Communist demagoguery that is trying to destroy us' (the military)."[171]

The USARCARIB School began providing counterinsurgency training to Latin American military as far back as 1944. During World War II, elements of the Nicaraguan National Guard were the first to receive jungle warfare training in Panama with the mobile team, and fifty officers from the Colombian War College also received "two week instruction with the Mobile force." Training at the USARCARIB School began with a subtle yet important shift in the 1959-1960 school year. The number of tactics and artillery courses had increased in 1960. For the first time in 1959, a majority of the students who graduated from the USARCARIB School came from Latin America. In the 1960 catalog, the school took pride in noting that just more than one-half (8324) of the 16,343 total students trained in its history did not come from the United States. More than ever, the school depended on its Latin American students, and Latin America wanted internal security training.[172]

---

[171] Ibid., 3; Elvis Stahr (Sec. of the Army) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, 27 April 1961, "Plan to Step Up Latin American Attendance in Counter-Guerrilla Training Activities," RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Admin. Files, 1955-1962, 1961 Cases, Box 436, FN AG 353, 1-6-61, 1. NARA II; Lemnitzer to President, JCSM 341-61, "Training," Appendix, "Training of Police and Armed Forces," 5. Kennedy Presidential Library; "U.S. to Set Up Guerrilla War School in C.Z.," Star Herald, 6 Apr. 1961, p. 1 col. 6; "Counter-Resistance Course Bared for Army Officers," Star Herald, [nd] May 1961, p. 1, col. 4; "Anti-Guerrilla Course Here Will Teach How Reds Operate," Star Herald, [nd] May 1961, p. 1, col. 6; and Louis Kraar, "U.S. Teaches Latins Anti-Guerrilla Tactics to Nip New Castros," WSJ, [nd] Aug. 1961, p. 1, col. 8. Ramsay Papers, John B. Amos Library.

[172] Office of the Staff Secretary, Caribbean Defense Command, Training in the Caribbean Defense Command, 1941-1946, 1948, HMF, 8-2.8 AC, 48-9; Historical Section, Panama Canal Department, "Training of Latin American Military Personnel in the Panama Canal Department," in Preliminary Historical Study, Panama Canal Department – Training, vol. 2, Department Schools, HMF 8-2.9 AM 57.

The USARCARIB School was in position to provide just that. The United States had used its control of territory in the Canal Zone to train U.S. military for many years. During World War II, British commandos brought their experience to Burma and south Asia. Following the war, the United States continued to send troops, in particular squads from U.S. Ranger battalions, to Ft. Sherman located across the river from Ft. Gulick. But it was not until 1959 that the USARCARIB School led the first cadre of Latin American students through the course at Ft. Sherman. Informally, instructors from the school took a small detachment from the Panamanian National Guard, led by a young, up-and-coming officer by the name of Manual Noriega, on a counter-guerilla course fashioned after the instruction given at the Jungle Training Center to prospective U.S. Army Rangers. During the summer of 1959, "Panamanian National Guardsmen . . . trained in the USARCARIB Jungle Warfare Training Center, quelled the riots in Panama." General Lemnizter cited this incident in JCSM 341-61 as proof of the situational efficacy of counterinsurgency training by the U.S. military.[173]

In tune with the changing times, the school incorporated internal security and counterinsurgency training into its new course on military intelligence. The "purpose" of this ten-week, 400-hour course in July 1960 was to "train selected personnel from Latin American military forces to perform military intelligence duties, with particular emphasis

---

CMH. See USARCARIB School, The USARCARIB School Catalog, 1959-1960 (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1959), xiv-xvii. John B. Amos Library; and ibid., v.

[173] Lt. Col. Russell Ramsay, Ret., oral history, 18 March 1998, John B. Amos Library; Lemnitzer to President, JCSM 341-61, "Training," Appendix, "Training of Police and Armed Forces," 1. Kennedy Presidential Library.

on techniques of recognizing and combating Communism as it affects the Latin American countries." Since there still existed precious little evidence of a threat of invasion by the Soviet Union, China, or even Cuba, which at the time of the publication of the 1960-61 course catalog was not yet accepted as a "pawn" of the USSR, this course could only apply to internal security, something Congress had specifically precluded U.S. personnel from teaching. The specific course content made that clear. The class taught Latin American students such mundane issues as "operational files and records" and "report writing principles," while it emphasized "counterespionage, counter-measures against sabotage, counter-subversion" and "combat operations." Students received instruction in such investigative techniques as the "use and employment of surveillance," "raids and searches," and "special operations." It offered an intensive section on the threat of the "Soviet Union and International Communism," where students studied "Communist theory," "Communist expansion," and "current Soviet trends." By 1961, the military intelligence course had expanded to become a class specifically and unabashedly targeted to "Latin American Intelligence and Counterintelligence Officers" and concentrated on the "principles and procedures used in security, counterespionage, countersabotage, and countersubversion." Students learned the "basic principles of countering" the "Communist threat" while they learned "its method of operation."[174]

[174] USARCARIB School, The USARCARIB School Catalog, 1960-1961 (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1960), 57-8; and USARCARIB School, The USARCARIB School Catalog, 1961-1962 (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1961), 53. John B. Amos Library.

Instructors from Ft. Gulick applied their experience to the first counterinsurgency course held at the Special Warfare Center at Ft. Bragg, North Carolina on January 27, 1961. Previously a Ranger instructor at Ft. Sherman, Lt. Russell Ramsay brought his counterinsurgency training experience to Ft. Bragg. Lt. Ramsay led several groups of military intelligence students in 1960 on the same Jungle Warfare Training route at Ft. Sherman along which he had ushered the first group of Panamanian National Guardsmen in 1959. Along with four members of the 7th Special Forces battalion stationed at Ft. Gulick, Ramsay led the class of twenty-nine foreign officers. Officers from the Andes led the group. Bolivia sent seven officers and Ecuador six. Only Argentina represented the Southern Cone with three officers at the first class at Ft. Bragg, and Guatemala dispatched five as the lone Central American entry. Four officers from NATO countries made the trip to North Carolina – two each from Norway and Turkey – along with two lieutenant colonels from Iran and one final student, a colonel from Indonesia, Achmad Sukendro. The students, an evaluation of the course asserted, while of "uneven quality, consist on the whole of younger officers of capacity and promise." The United States justified the training as necessary due to the growing threat of "dissident movements, which may be combined with irregular military operations . . . and that non-communist governments and their armed forces do not possess an adequate defense capability in this field at present." The army added the counterinsurgency course to the psychological

operations and unconventional warfare courses already in operation at the Special Warfare Center.[175]

The U.S. Army in its classes at Ft. Bragg emphasized the importance of ideologically driven psychological warfare. Consequently, instruction focused on the "nature and causes of resistance movements, communist efforts to exploit them, and successful and unsuccessful efforts to counter them, to be presented where possible on a historical and factual basis." Instructors at Ft. Bragg preferred to use Mao to provide "teaching points" on the Sino-Soviet methods they would likely encounter. In their encapsulation of Mao, U.S. Army officers stressed that "guerrilla successes largely depend upon powerful political leaders" for whom "military action is a method to attain a political goal." Instructors at Ft. Bragg sought to instill in their students the necessity of holding the initiative in this battle for political control. "It is the side that holds the initiative that has liberty of action," students were admonished. Regardless of the name used – "revolution, rebellion, insurgency, guerilla warfare" – the primary entity to any movement was the "rebel": "the rebel comes first; the rebellion second." Rebellions

---

[175] Ramsay, oral history; HQ (SWC), Special Orders, No. 43, 10 March 1961, Ramsay Papers, 1. John B. Amos Library; Wymberly DeR. Coerr to Harvey R. Wellman (U.S. Army Spec. Warfare School), letter, 19 Feb. 1961, Enclosure, "Counter-Guerrilla Operations Course, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Preliminary Observations," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Regional Political Affairs, Country and Subject Files, 1950-1963, Box 6, FN Defense Affairs, DEF 6-9 Schools and Academies, Fort Bragg, 1; Harvey R. Wellman (ARA, Fort Bragg) to Wymberley DeR. Coerr (ARA), comments, 28 Feb. 1961, "Counter Guerilla Course, United States Army Special Warfare School, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Comments of State Department Representative," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Regional Political Affairs (ARA/RPA), Country and Subject Files, Box 6, FN Defense Affairs DEF 6-9 Schools and Academies Fort Bragg, 1; and DeR. Coerr to Wellman, Enclosure, "Counter-Guerrilla Operations," 1. NARA II.

depended on cadre morale and continued erosion of regime support, which is why the U.S. Army stressed the importance of "psychological warfare techniques . . . utilized to sensitize the indifferent populations" to counter the propaganda campaigns launched by insurgents. Guerrillas themselves, the army contended, were "highly susceptible [sic] to propaganda" and did not recognize that the "cause" simply masked a naked power grab. Consequently, the army sought to "anticipate and remove the causes of resistance exploitable by communism."[176]

The army, not surprisingly, believed the instruction at Ft. Bragg to be worth repeating. The United States pointed to the alarming rise in "dissident movements" around the world that had been co-opted by international Communism. And in Algeria, Laos, Vietnam, and Cuba, dissident movements had "combined with irregular military operations." Again and again, agents of the United States from the highest levels on down would cite each of these instances as ample justification for continuing counterinsurgency training, especially for "non-communist governments and their armed forces [which] do not possess an adequate defense capability in this field at present." To

---

[176] Harvey R. Wellman (ARA, Fort Bragg) to Wymberley DeR. Coerr (ARA), Comments, 28 Feb. 1961, "Counter Guerilla Course United States Army Special Warfare School, Fort Bragg North Carolina: Comments of State Department Representative," Annex 1, "Consideration for Counter Guerrilla Operations," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Regional Political Affairs (ARA/RPA), Country and Subject Files, Box 6, FN Defense Affairs DEF 6-9 Schools and Academies Fort Bragg, 3. NARA II; Counter Guerrilla Operations Department, U.S. Army, Ft. Bragg, North Carolina, CG 1100, Feb. 1961, "Summary of Principles of Resistance Movements and Guerrilla Operations," Ramsay Papers, 1. John B. Amos Library; ibid., 3; ibid., 4; ibid., 5; and Harvey R. Wellman (ARA, Fort Bragg) to Wymberley DeR. Coerr (ARA), Comments, 28 Feb. 1961, "Counter Guerilla Course United States Army Special Warfare School, Fort Bragg North Carolina: Comments of State Department Representative," Annex 2, "Doctrine and Theory," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Regional Political Affairs (ARA/RPA), Country and Subject Files, Box 6, FN Defense Affairs DEF 6-9 Schools and Academies Fort Bragg, 4. NARA II.

meet this growing need for internal security training, Gen. Lemnitzer informed the president on May 19, 1963 in JCSM 341-61 that "subsequent Counterguerrilla Operations and Tactics Courses at Fort Bragg are being programmed for 100 students with a proportionate increase in students from Latin America." In evaluating the first class at Ft. Bragg, commanders at the Special Warfare Center concluded that since "such a course cannot be restricted to military considerations . . . An appreciation of non-military factors is required." In addition to identifying the "strategy and tactics of international Communism," the U.S. Army believed that counterinsurgency students needed to understand the "free world concept and rationale of evolutionary change." Perhaps most important, instructors wanted domestic and foreign military students to appreciate the "contributions which the armed forces can make" in facilitating government-sponsored programs designed for "meeting legitimate popular needs and aspirations." But the Department of State representative at the first class at Ft. Bragg, Harvey Wellman, argued that the United States should "avoid starting as a hypothesis that the US . . . has been invited into a country to engage in CG operations," since such a supposition "may create undesirable reactions among certain foreign students, especially from Latin American countries devoted to the principle of non-intervention." Instead, the United States should emphasize in its training the importance of students disseminating their instruction to their own militaries. Wellman also attacked the army's insistence that foreign students possess advanced English language skills. Instead, he argued that "the principle criteria for the selection of allied officers for training should be their capacity, duties and future prospects and the country's need, not their English comprehension." So revised, the

army launched its second counterinsurgency course on May 15, 1963 with double the number of students, "including 23 officers from Latin America (Argentina 3, Bolivia 8, Ecuador 6, Guatemala 5 and Nicaragua 1)," once again led by Lt. Ramsay.[177]

**A SCHOOL FOR THE AMERICAS**

The USARCARIB School took advantage of the White House's unprecedented interest in counterinsurgency to launch a major campaign to make itself the primary institution for Latin American training. In early 1961 the new Commandant, Colonel Edgar Schroeder, installed a branch at the school to reflect the new emphasis on counterguerilla training. The new Department of Internal Security included "sections" devoted to "Counterinsurgency Operations," "Military Intelligence," Military Police," "Research and Analysis," and "Medical." In 1961, "in recognition of the increasing Communist threat in Latin America, those courses which were most directly related to national internal defense capabilities were grouped into one department." By 1962, the school declared in its catalog that "Every course taught has definite application in the counterinsurgency field." And the school assured that the new "Department provides instruction in every aspect of counterinsurgency operations, be it military, paramilitary, political, sociological, or psychological." At the Inter-American Army Conference held at Ft. Amador July 10-14, 1961, the Counter Resistance head at the USARCARIB School, Lt. Col. Felipe Vías, informed the assembled generals that the new "course

[177] Counter Guerrilla Operations Department, "Summary of Principles," Ramsay Papers, 3. John B. Amos Library; Lemnitzer to President, "Training," Appendix, "Training of Police and Armed Forces,"

devotes 60 hours to Civic Action," which instructed members of the Latin American military in the importance of "stimulation of economic growth by civic action." The colonel added that the "Military Police Section will cover public relations, physical security, and tactical and psychological factors necessary to quell a disturbance in the early period without unnecessary bloodshed." The school added a shorter and smaller Senior Officers course that concentrated on Communist tactics, "propaganda techniques, infiltration tactics, front groups" and the role of civic action as "an instrument for fostering . . . active [civilian] participation and support of counter-resistance operations."[178]

The USARCARIB School also sought to advertise its new offerings. As part of its effort to extol the virtues of counterinsurgency training at Ft. Gulick, the school in late 1961 wrote a special internal security and counterinsurgency publication to highlight the coming year's courses. The school did so in a manner that fundamentally altered the format and content of its course catalog. Ordinarily, the format of USARCARIB School course catalogs did not vary. Annual course catalogs routinely began with a photo and

---

3. Kennedy Presidential Library; Counter Guerrilla Operations Department, "Summary of Principles," Ramsay Papers, 3; ibid., 5; ibid., 8; and Ramsay, oral history. John B. Amos Library.

[178] USARCARIB School, The U.S. Army Caribbean School: "One for All and All for One" (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1962), 5. John B. Amos Library; Lt. Col. Felipe Vías, "Counter Resistance Training," in USARCARIB, Final Report: Inter-American Army Conference, 1961 (Ft. Amador, C.Z.: USARCARIB, 1961), 87-91, RG 218 Records of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Central Decimal File, 1961, Box 168, FN CCS 9125-5410 Central America (17 July 1961), 87. NARA II; USARCARIB School, The U.S. Army Caribbean School: History and Operations (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1962), 5-6; Lt. Col. Felipe Vías, "Counter Resistance Training, 90; and USARCARIB School, The U.S. Army Caribbean School: History and Operations (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1962), 5. John B. Amos Library.

biography of the current Commander of the U.S. Army Caribbean Command, followed by a photo and biography of the Commandant of the school. Next, the catalog would briefly list the mission and history of the school, routinely copying these from one year to the next. Then the catalog would list the course offerings for the coming school year, beginning July 1 of each calendar year, followed by a more detailed discussion of each course and, finally, a brief discussion of the recreational facilities. In the 1962 effort, however, the staff at Ft. Gulick presented a detailed history of instruction designed to enhance its emerging mission and promote the school as the primary source of internal security training for the Americas. The 1962-63 advisory also included a number of photos which showed counterinsurgency students in action in the classroom and in the field. One photo showed students completing a "trestle bridge," and another depicted a team engaged in bridge demolition exercises. Along with "truck engine repair," judo, and volleyball, the USARCARIB School offered photos highlighting an "improvised parachute" made out of woven leaves designed for "aerial resupply." Apparently, prospective students could hope that "resupply" did not include personnel. The school ended its description by noting that "though we have not mentioned every course in detail, we want to reiterate that the entire school is dedicated to the counterinsurgency effort." Indeed, the school clearly charted each of the coming year's offerings – from cadet training to command and staff to engineering to communications to radio report to

small arms repair to heavy equipment – to show that all applied to counterinsurgency and internal security.[179]

The USARCARIB School offered two courses to satisfy the demand of Latin American military eager for the latest in internal security operations from the United States. In addition to the ten-week unit training courses, the school offered four, two-week "orientation" courses for command grade officers each school year. In December, 1961, the second orientation course included two generals from Bolivia and another from Mexico, a total of five colonels from Guatemala, Puerto Rico, El Salvador, and Mexico, and seven majors, with representatives from Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Venezuela. A captain from Brazil rounded out the class. The course was designed to familiarize "Field grade and General Officers with the nature and conduct of counterinsurgency operations." In addition to reviewing some "mutual problems," such as intelligence gathering and "tactical operations against dissident groups," the class sought to "familiarize" these students with the "capabilities and potential of graduates of the regular course." The ten-week course concentrated on the origins of counterresistance doctrine, and the theoretical and practical application of military intelligence and civic action, along with the array of tactical operations, for example demolitions, heavy machinery, small arms, rifle repair, and marksmanship, consonant with U.S. Special Forces training. The school spent considerable time studying various

---

[179] USARCARIB School, The U.S. Army Caribbean School: "One for All and All for One" (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1962), 1-6. John B. Amos Library; ibid., 10-11; ibid., 12-6; and ibid., 6.

historical insurgent movements, from Malaysia and Burma during World War II, to the American campaigns in the Philippines, to contemporary movements in Laos, Vietnam, Algeria, and, of course, Cuba. Additionally, various instructors proffered weekly discussions on such topics as the "function of democratic government," "Communism versus democracy," and "fallacies of Communism," along with instruction in "public relations," "treatment of prisoners," and "psychological warfare." In addition to the class room, students in the ten-week counterinsurgency course participated in field exercises each week and concluded the course with a two-week stint at the Jungle Warfare School.[180]

The USARCARIB School also sought to present training at Ft. Gulick as specifically designed to meet the needs of Latin American students. U.S. military personnel represented the bulk of the student body at the USARCARIB School up until 1959. The trend toward more and more Latin American students had been growing for several years, and commandants of the school had already adjusted to the declining interest of the U.S. Army by actively recruiting from the region's military. At the 1961 General's Conference, the school's new head of counterresistance, Lt. Col. Vías, took the opportunity to point out to the assembled officers that while "a similar course is being conducted in English at Fort Bragg . . . our course is tailored to meet the needs of the

---

[180] Ibid., 8; USARCARIB School, "Sección de Operaciones de Contrainsurreción: Curso de Orientación, #2," Ramsay Papers, 1-3; USARCARIB School, The U.S. Army Caribbean School Catalog, 1963 (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1962), 24; and Tte Col. Aiden P. Shipley, Dir. de Instr., La Escuela USARCARIB, Fuerte Gulick, Zona del Canal, Horario de Instrucción, Departamento de Seguridad Interna, "Curso: Contra Resistencia," Clase Num. 1, Semana 1-10, 31 Julio al 6 de Oct., Ramsay Papers, 1-20. John B. Amos Library.

American nations." Indeed, the school advertised its connection to Latin America with the 1962-1963 course catalog. Since 1949, the USARCARIB School had made a point in the brief history paragraph that helped to introduce the annual course catalog to include a mention of the raw numbers of students who had passed through its doors. In doing so, the school tried to distinguish the number of Latin American students. Prior to 1962, however, such mentions came almost in passing. In 1962, the school added what would become a staple feature to the course catalog: a regional map. The map showed prospective students the number of servicemen from each Latin American country who had attended training at the school. Not surprisingly, Argentina had sent the fewest number of students of all the South American nations to the facility at Ft. Gulick up to 1961. Mexico and Brazil also had sent few personnel. Along with Mexico and Brazil, Argentina had long had a developed professional military with established and recognized military academies. Generally, students from these military preferred the more prestigious training opportunities presented in the United States at the Command and General Staff College, the Army and Naval War Colleges, and even West Point. Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela, in that order, had sent the most students from South America. The USARCARIB School drew most of its students from Central America, primarily training Costa Rica's national police force (the 1948 constitution outlawed a military), and the National Guards of Panama and Nicaragua. More than one-sixth of all the Latin American students trained at the USARCARIB School came from Nicaragua.[181]

---

[181] Vías, "Counter Resistance Training," in Final Report, 87. NARA II; USARCARIB School, "One for All and All for One", 7. John B. Amos Library. See John Patrick Bells, Crisis in Costa Rica:

The USARCARIB School's enrollment, however, did suffer from the vagaries of military politics. To begin with, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of Defense promoted foreign military training by MAAGs and the like. For their part, Latin American military preferred the more prestigious service schools in the United States. And the U.S. armed services wanted foreign military who sought training outside their home countries to take classes in the United States. As a result, the USARCARIB School had to take care not to appear to compete with U.S. service schools. Language also continued to be a recruiting problem. Repeatedly, senior military staff in the Pentagon dismissed language as a problem. But State and Defense Department representatives in Latin America had difficulty finding military who "speak and understand English," and those who could "frequently do not have the educational or technical background" to comprehend U.S. military courses, let alone technical ones, taught in either language. Beyond language skills, many of the Latin American students were barely literate. "Even in a country like Brazil," one ranking State Department official argued, "which is more highly developed than the so-called 'Indian' countries, the recruit frequently hasn't been exposed to modern plumbing facilities, simple hand tools, etc." Since the 1950s, advocates of military training for Latin American troops argued that U.S. instructors provided not only literacy but also a priceless education on contemporary western life. The army responded that they did not have to alter policy since Ft. Gulick existed for students who could not speak English. The cost of sending students remained a persistent

---

Revolution in 1948 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971) for discussion of the 1948 constitution.

problem for Latin American militaries. The French and German military missions of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had borne the cost of Latin American students, so Latin American military commanders expected the United States to pay as well. After all, it was the United States who wanted Latin America to follow U.S. doctrine. The Kennedy administration, like Eisenhower's, resisted paying the per diem for Latin American students. The army used a loophole to avoid paying foreign military who attended Ft. Gulick the per diem customarily provided to foreign military students attending service colleges and schools in the United States because the USARCARIB School was located in Panama. The best the army would do was agree to assess per diem payment on a case-by-case basis in the future. Consequently, the school confronted a number of factors out of its control that contributed to low enrollment.[182]

The attorney general rejected any explanations when he attacked the low turnout at Ft. Gulick in early January 1961. Robert Kennedy, his brother Edward, and Undersecretary of Defense Joseph Califano traveled to Ft. Gulick on the attorney general's Central American tour just after Christmas 1962. On his return to Washington, D.C., the president's brother reported to the Special Group (CI) that only 17 of 435 foreign military trained in counterinsurgency by the United States in 1961 had gone to Ft. Gulick. He argued that this proved that the army was "not giving sufficient emphasis in

---

[182] George O. Spencer (RPA/S) to Allen (ARA/RPA), 10 Apr. 1963, RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Regional Political Affairs, Country and Subject Files, 1950-1963, Box 6, FN Defense Affairs, DEF 6-9 Schools and Academies, 1962-1963, 1-2; and Col. Calvin S. Hannum (Chief, OIA/USARSO) to Cyrus Vance (Undersec. Army), memorandum, 22 Aug. 1963, "Increasing Latin American Students at Army Schools in Panama," RG 319, DCSOPS, Classified Correspondence, 1961-64, Box 41, FN 1003-02, 22 Aug. 1963, 1. NARA II.

Latin America to counterinsurgency." He assigned Marine Corps General Victor H. Krulak to resolve the problem. Krulak rather blithely reported back that he could not understand why the USARCARIB School had such difficulty meeting their quotas, but that the problem could easily be resolved by using Camp Pendleton. The USARCARIB School, though, actually trained somewhat more than seventeen students in counterinsurgency during 1961. No fewer than seventy-three Latin American junior officers, with representatives from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, and Venezuela, completed the first ten-week counterinsurgency course. An additional thirty-nine completed the senior officers' counterinsurgency orientation course. Another fifty-six finished the military intelligence course, which included a two-week training exercise at the Jungle Warfare Center. On top of this, thirty-two Guatemalan and seventy-four Venezuelan MPs completed instruction at the USARCARIB School in 1961. The school tried to make its case that "the student load of the USARCARIB School is entirely dependent upon economic factors, political conditions, and internal affairs of the Latin American republics." The attorney general remained unconvinced. The army relieved Colonel Schroeder as Commandant of the USARCARIB School soon after the attorney general returned to Washington, D.C. in February 1963. Robert Kennedy had fought with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, an army general, to get his brother, the president, accurate information. President Kennedy battled with the Joint Chiefs who carried out his orders but resisted his efforts to direct the course and content of their actions. In his frustration, perhaps, the attorney general targeted the school and its commandant, not

only for the perceived recruitment failure, but to send a message to the diffident chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.[183]

The Kennedy administration also tried to send a message to Latin America when they renamed the facility at Ft. Gulick on July 1, 1963: the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The attorney general's visit spawned the reorganization of not only training at Ft. Gulick but the entire Caribbean Command. To ensure that the army appreciated its priorities, President Kennedy ordered the Department of Defense to revise the command structure for Latin America to reflect a hemispheric purpose. The Caribbean Command received its new designation, the U.S. Southern Command. USARSO's responsibilities extend to the tip of South America, a far cry from protection of the Panama Canal and the shipping lanes of the Caribbean. As part of this reshuffling, the undersecretary of the army, Cyrus Vance, ordered a complete evaluation of the training at Ft. Gulick with an eye to "increasing Latin American Students at Army Schools in Panama." The Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended that students at Ft. Gulick also receive tours of such institutions as the Command and General Staff College as a measure to enhance the

---

[183] Ramsay, oral history; Thomas W. Davis (Exec. Sec., Spec. Group (CI)), memorandum, 4 Jan. 1963, "Minutes of the Meeting of the Special Group (CI)," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 2, FN Special Group (CI) 1/17/63-3/7/63, 2. NARA II; ibid., 1; George O. Spencer (RPA/S) to Allen (ARA/RPA), 10 Apr. 1963, RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Inter-American Regional Political Affairs, Country and Subject Files, 1950-1963, Box 6, FN Defense Affairs, DEF 6-9 Schools and Academies, 1962-1963, 1; Sterling J. Cotrell (ARA) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, 17 Dec. 1963, "Terrorism in the Latin American Countries on the Critical List: Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Venezuela," RG 59 General Records of the Dept. of State, Executive Secretariat, Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966, Box 3, FN Special Group (CI) 10/17-12/19/63, 1. NARA II; USARCARIB School, The U.S. Army Caribbean School Catalog, 1963 (USARCARIB School: Ft. Gulick, CA, 1962), vii. John B. Amos Library; and Ramsay, oral history.

experience for USARCARIB students. Students would now receive diplomas and certificates equivalent to those received by students attending classes in the United States. The army also ordered Ft. Gulick to add an airborne training course to its regimen. The school, for its part, had already adopted "a general school policy" of more time on field operations. As an added touch, the army concurred that the newly designated School of the Americas ought to have a new insignia. Colonel Cecil Himes, Commandant of the USARCARIB School from 1959-1961, wrote that Latin American military students proudly "wore our school crest on their uniforms" when they returned home "to show they were graduates." The army approved the new patch, which included the school motto, "Uno para todos, todos para uno."[184]

The staff at Ft. Gulick promptly launched yet another promotional campaign for 1963 to bolster the image of its training in Latin America. Part of that effort included the publication of a triennial review of school activities entitled, "El Faro Americano," or the American Beacon. In the first issue, the USARCARIB School declared that the "principal mission of the Director of Instruction is to assure that the caliber of instruction

---

[184] JCS, General Order No. 8, 1 July 1963, "Redesignation of Unit," in Col. Harry D. Temple (USARSO) to Commandant (USARSA) letter, 13 Sep. 1963, Distinctive Insignia Request, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1-2. CMH; Howard, E. Haugerud (Dep. U/ISA) to Cyrus Vance (Undersec. Army), memorandum, 25 Apr. 1963, "Increasing Latin American Students at Army Schools in Panama," RG 391 DCSOPS, Classified Correspondence, 1961-1964, Box 41, FN 1003-02, 25 Apr. 1963, 1; Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson (DCSOPS) to Cyrus Vance (Undersec. Def.), memorandum, 28 June 1963, "Increasing Latin American Students at Army Schools in Panama," Inclosure, "Report," 1; idem, "Increasing Latin American Students at Army Schools in Panama," 2; idem, "Increasing Latin American Students at Army Schools in Panama," Inclosure, "Report," RG 391 DCSOPS, Classified Correspondence, 1961-64, Box 41, FN 1003-02, 28 June 1963, 3; J. F. Monahan, to (Schroeder), Commandant, letter, 15 Jan. 1963, "Operational Analysis Report, USARCARIB School," RG 498 U.S. Army Caribbean School [School of the Americas], Box 1, FN 201-46, Operations Planning Files, CY 1962, 5. NARA II; and JCS, General Order No. 8, 1 July 1963.

presented at the school is the same, or better, as the caliber of instruction presented in our principal service schools." The review went on to call the school the "only institute wholly for perfecting Latin American military personnel." When an Argentinean lieutenant colonel graduated from the Command and General Staff course with honors, his country's ambassador presented the award. The school regularly celebrated its graduates, but in September 1964, the Southern Command awarded a medal of valor to an Ecuadoran colonel and a Brazilian captain, which, the school took pains to note, "is not frequently conferred."[185]

The U.S. Army School of the Americas also increased the number of guest instructors from Latin American militaries. To better facilitate the integration of Latin American military students, the school's commandants began in 1956 to try to retain some of the better students to remain as instructors for the subsequent session. In January 1963 "El Faro Americano" reported that a graduate of the Chorrillos Military School in Peru would return to Ft. Gulick to assist after a visit home. Later that June 1963, the USARCARIB School celebrated guest speakers from the Chorrillos Military School, which sent a number of graduates to Ft. Gulick in 1962-1963. The Joint Chiefs reported in late June 1963 that Ft. Gulick's efforts were working. Projected enrollment for 1964 rose considerably. That same month, the school tapped the first Latin American to an

---

[185] USARCARIB School Mission," El faro Americano vol. 1 no. 1 (Oct. 1962), 14; "El único instituto integral para perfeccionamiento de personal de los Ejércitos Latinoamericanos," in "Curso de commando y estado mayor," El faro Americano vol. 1 no. 4 (Jul. 1963), 5; "Graduado de honor," in El faro Americano vol. 1 no. 1 (Oct. 1962), 14; and "No es conferida con frecuencia," in El faro Americano vol. 3 no. 1 (Sept. 1964), RG 498 U.S. Army Caribbean School [School of the Americas], Box 1, FN 205-02, Publications Records Sets, 1963, 8. NARA II.

administrative position when Capitan José A. Fierro from Mexico "was assigned to the public relations office" of the newly renamed U.S. Army School of the Americas. A board for review from Washington concluded that the "adequacy, timeliness, appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic efforts of the school are commendably fulfilled."[186]

**"THE MOST DANGEROUS AREA"**

John F. Kennedy characterized Latin America as the "most dangerous area in the world." He saw in the rise of dissident insurgencies around the globe a pattern of attack directed by Moscow. The perceived successful cooptation of those movements by international Communism, most notably in the case of Cuba, convinced the Kennedy administration that the United States had to reorient its defense posture. A different era and a different type of conflict required a different response: counterinsurgency. Latin America, however, had proven weaknesses. Inconsistency marked military training and capability for the region as a whole, and the Joint Chiefs feared that Latin Americans did not adequately appreciate the extent of the Soviet threat. Ft. Gulick initially seemed the

---

[186] RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands, U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964, Box 71. File No. 352.16; "Nuevas instructores invitados," in "USARCARIB School Mission," El faro Americano vol. 1 no. 2 (Jan. 1963), 5; "Graduados del Colegio Militar de Chorrillos en Perú Platicán," in "USARCARIB School Mission," El faro Americano vol. 1 no. 4 (Jul. 1963), RG 498 U.S. Army Caribbean School [School of the Americas], Box 1, FN 205-02, Publications Records Sets, 1963, 10; Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson (DCSOPS) to Cyrus Vance (Undersec Def.), memorandum, 28 June 1963, "Increasing Latin American Students at Army Schools in Panama," RG 391 DSCOPS, Classified Correspondence, 1961-64, Box 41, FN 1003-02, 28 June 1963, 1; "El capitán José A. Fierro, oriundo de Chihuahua, México, fue asignado Oficial de Relaciones Públicas de la Escuela de las Américas," in "USARCARIB School Mission," El faro Americano vol. 1 no. 4 (Jul. 1963), RG 498 U.S. Army Caribbean School [School of the Americas], Box 1, FN 205-02, Publications Records Sets, 1963, 12; and Johnson to Cyrus Vance, "Increasing Latin American Students," 2. NARA II.

best place to provide the counterinsurgency training that Latin America needed. Instructors at the USARCARIB School brought their experience to Ft. Bragg to provide the foundation for counterinsurgency training at the Special Warfare Center. And the school expanded its own offerings, including a course just for senior grade officers. But despite the efforts of the USARCARIB School to become the primary installation for counterinsurgency training, the U.S. Army preferred the Special Warfare Center at Ft. Bragg. Beyond that, the change in policy had led to a fundamental shift in training throughout the entire military establishment. Consequently, the USARCARIB School rapidly found itself simply one of a multitude of training options available to the United States military. The name change to the U.S. Army School of the Americas did not change Ft. Gulick's role. The Joint Chiefs still wanted to direct training via MAAGs, missions, and military attachés to U.S. embassies in the region. And even beyond these staples, Special Forces Mobile Training Teams (MTTs) became the favored assessment and training instrument. Not only could the U.S. armed services keep costs down in this manner, the Joint Chiefs could target training more specifically to meet the needs of the United States rather than the often misguided desires of Latin Americans.

Not surprisingly, the United States slotted Latin America for a rather limited role in the new defense posture: internal security and anti-submarine defense. The JCS first enunciated this new role at the end of November 1961 with JCSM 832-61. To begin with, the Joint Chiefs argued the need to "orient the Latin American armed forces to accept the apolitical role of the military." Next, the United States believed that it needed to reorient the "Latin American leadership . . . toward internal rather than external

security." JCSM 832-61 argued that improving the "capability of indigenous forces in disaster relief" would help shift the region's military to internal priorities. JCSM 832-61 then detailed the variety of U.S. armed forces activities vis a vis Latin America, the overwhelming bulk of which, in most respects, had emerged under Eisenhower. Now, however, these programs fulfilled a grander purpose. For example, JCSM 832-61 recommended that the United States government expand a public relations mainstay of the 1950s, "the Inter-American Geodetic Survey," since "accurate topographic maps of Latin America are required for hemispheric defense and for economic and sociological development" (not to mention internal security). Latin America would continue its coast watching responsibility, but now the United States would line the coasts with the technologically advanced detection posts. The report also foresaw the Inter-American Defense College as an "excellent means for increasing US influence among the current and emerging Latin American military leadership." Later in March 1962, the deputy assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs singled out the Inter-American Defense Board to "improve Latin American combined intelligence capability." Additionally, the Joint Chiefs suggested that the United States should "provide opportunities for Latin American scientific personnel to work and study in US military installations in the fields of food service, sanitation, medicine, and the technical fields." Most of all, the United States military insisted that "the Latin American military man must be motivated to help his country help itself."[187]

---

[187] Lemnitzer to President Kennedy, JCSM 832-61, "Military Actions for Latin America (U)," Appendix A, "Military Actions for Latin America – Part I Recommendations with Statement of the

The United States wanted Latin American counterinsurgency students to take U.S. training back to their military. But the United States still possessed limited training capacity by August 1961. The Joint Chiefs of Staff received a "progress report" on August 3, 1961 that highlighted the training provided by the Caribbean Command, especially that offered by the USARCARIB School at Ft. Gulick. The Report listed courses in "riot control," "anti-guerilla," and "psychological operations." Additionally, the joint secretariat to the JCS stressed the emphasis placed by the Caribbean Command on the assessment work being done by the various MAAGs "assigned in Ecuador and Guatemala" and the requests for internal security training made by "Bolivia, Chile Paraguay, Peru, Nicaragua, Cost Rica, and Honduras." Most important, the Caribbean Command touted the creation of "mobile training teams," graduates of the programs at Ft. Bragg and Ft. Gulick who would form the cadres "dispatched to Latin American countries for purposes of assisting in the establishment of in-country training courses."[188]

---

Problem and Need for Action"; Lemnitzer to President Kennedy, JCSM 832-61, Appendix B, "Military Actions for Latin America – Part II," 10; ibid., 6; Hayden Williams (Dep. ASD/ISA) to Gen. Maxwell Taylor (Chair Spec. Group CI), memorandum, 2 Mar. 1962, "Report on Participation of U.S. and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America," Tab A-4; idem, "Report on Participation of U.S. and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment o Common Objectives in Latin America," Appendix B, Annex A, "Ideas Being Considered for Possible Development and Future Submission," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118—JCS Proposal, Tab B, Annex c, 4-33, 7; Lemnitzer to President Kennedy, JCSM 832-61, Annex D, "Proposed Implementation for a Latin American Military Information and Education Program," to Appendix B, "Military Actions for Latin America – Part II," Attachment to Gen. Maxwell Taylor (Chair Spec. Group CI) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, 5 Dec. 1961, 6. Kennedy Presidential Library.

[188] E. J. Blouin and M. J. Ingelido (Joint Sec. JCS) to JCS, note, JCS 1976/375, 3 Aug. 1961, "Progress Report on the Program of Department of Defense Support to the Strengthening of Internal Security in Latin America Including Status of Development of Counterguerrilla Forces (U)," 3536; idem, "Progress Report on the Program of Department of Defense Support to the Strengthening of Internal Security in Latin America Including Status of Development of Counterguerrilla Forces (U)," Capt. E. S. Powell (DCOS/CINCARIB) to JCS, memorandum, 29 July 1961, "Progress Report," Inclosure 1, "Progress

By November, however, the Caribbean Command had favorable news. The Joint Chiefs learned that "recent graduates of the Fort Gulick counter-resistance course" from El Salvador were scheduled to give counterinsurgency courses at the "General Command Staff School" in their country. Honduras, too, followed suit as "three recent graduates" from Ft. Gulick now provided training to a "Unit of the 1st Honduran Military Zone." Costa Rica planned to have as many as 120 members of its National Police receive training at Ft. Gulick by the end of 1962. And Nicaragua determined that "all new lieutenants in the Guardia Nacional" must receive six months counterguerrilla instruction in order to train border patrol units. Even Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil sought out U.S. counterresistance training. The USARCARIB School set up one special course just for members of Argentina's general staff as well as one entire ten-week counterinsurgency section for a class of cadets in the fall of 1961. "The General Staff School of the Military Institute of Superior Studies" in Uruguay now had in its "curriculum a number of hours devoted to counter-resistance subjects" taught by graduates of the USARCARIB School. And Brazil's airborne units established their own "'Ranger-Special Forces School'." Latin America was taking the training home.[189]

---

Report on the Program of Department of Defense Support to the Strengthening of Internal Security in Latin America Including Status of Development of Counterguerrilla Forces – as of 30 June 1961," RG 218, Records of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Central Decimal File, 1961, Box 165, FN CCS 9122/9105 Central America (8 May (2)), Sec. 1, 2; ibid., 1; and ibid., 3.

[189] Lt. Col. R. N. Dallam (Sec. COS/CINCARIB) to JCS, memorandum, 1 Nov. 1961, "Progress Report," Inclosure 1, "Progress Report on the Program of Department of Defense Support to the Strengthening of Internal Security in Latin America Including Status of Development of Counterguerrilla Forces – as of 30 Sept. 1961," in F. J. Blouin and M. J. Ingelido (Joint Sec. JCS) to JCS, note, JCS 1976/375, 8 Nov. 1961, in "Progress Report on the Program of Department of Defense Support to the Strengthening of Internal Security in Latin America Including Status of Development of Counterguerrilla

The classes at Ft. Gulick proved to be but the first of an inclusive training regimen. Even though the president struggled with the JCS over control of the pace and direction with which the United States integrated counterinsurgency training in 1961 and 1962, the JCS could by January 1962 boast of forty-seven different programs designed to increase internal security in Latin America. The United States military now had a wide array of training facilities in all branches of the armed services, providing "internal security tours," "civil affairs training," "riot control and psychological operations," and "hydrographic training," along with the essential counterguerrilla or counterresistance operations training. If foreign militaries wanted training outside their own countries' service schools, then the Department of Defense directed them to "U.S. military schools and colleges," not the facility in Panama. General Lemnitzer had already rejected language as an impediment to Latin American military instruction, contending that an "English language refresher course" perhaps using "tapes and listening booths will suffice in most cases." Still, the Department of Defense wanted more officers teaching in Latin American service academies. In early 1962, the United States had instructors "serving on faculties of military schools in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. The United States, however, proved reluctant to send its troops to Latin American service schools as students. In mid-September 1961, the Joint Chiefs received a report from Ft. Amador that eighteen of the forty-eight military schools in Latin America – those in Colombia, Brazil, Peru, Argentina, Uruguay, Chile and Venezuela – "are considered

---

Forces (U)," RG 218, Records of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Central Decimal File, 1961, Box 165, FN CCS 9122/9105 (8 May (2)), Sec. 1 Central America, 2; ibid., 3; ibid., 3-4; ibid., 2; and ibid., 4.

appropriate for attendance by United States military officers." Brazil patterned the Superior War College in Brazil after the U.S. National War College. Rear Admiral E. J. Blouin, the secretary to the Joint Chiefs, warned his commanders in mid-November, 1961 that "Latins are proud of these schools and resent the fact that the United States consistently refuses to accept proffered vacancies." Hence, he recommended that U.S. officers attend Latin schools prior to teaching there as part of MAAG and mission duty. So, despite the secretary of the army's initial enthusiasm for the training offered at Ft. Gulick, by the end of 1961, the USARCARIB School had simply become one of many training options available to the U.S. armed forces, and not the preferred mode of instruction.[190]

---

[190] L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair JCS) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, JCSM 30-62, 13 Jan. 19, "Participation of the US and Latin American Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America," Appendix A, "Participation of the US and Latin American Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America," Annex A, "Current Action to Comply with NSAM No. 118 (These Are New Proposals or Recommendations for Substantive Augmentation of Programs Already in Existence (Annex B))," and Annex B, "Programs Underway in Support of JCSM 832-61 Prior to Issuance of NSAM No. 118," 1-3; idem, Appendix A, Annex B, "Programs Underway in Support of JCSM 832-61 Prior to Issuance of NSAM No. 118," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118-JCS Proposal Tab B, Annex A, 3/62, 1; Roswell L. Gilpatric (Dep. Sec. of Def.) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, "Department of Defense Report on NSAM 131 – Training Objectives for Counter-Insurgency," Annex, "Counterinsurgency Training for U.S. and Foreign Officers in U.S. Military Schools and Colleges," NSF, NSAM, Box 334, FN NSAM 131 – Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency, Memoranda, 6/1-6/4/62, 1-22; Lemnitzer to President Kennedy, JCSM 832-61, Appendix B, "Military Actions for Latin America – Part II," 1-2. Kennedy Presidential Library; Daniel A. O'Connor (COSCARIBCOM) to JCS, memorandum, 18 Sept. 1961, "Attendance of Latin American Staff Colleges/Schools by United States Military Officers," Enclosure, RG 218 Records of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Central Decimal File, 1961, Box 165, FN CCS 9122-2000 Central America (18 Sept. 1961), 1-2; Elbrick (Río de Janeiro) to Department of State, airgram, #A-511, 2 Sept. 1969, "Role of Military in Brazil," Enclosure, "Embassy Contribution to JCS Report on Role of the Military," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files, 1967-1969, Political and Defense, Box 1569, FN DEF 1/1/69 LA, 1-11. NARA II. See also Davis, Brotherhood of Arms, 93-115. RAdm. E. J. Blouin (Sec. JCS) to JCS, memorandum, 15 Nov. 1961, "Attendance at Latin American Staff Schools/Colleges by US Officers (U)," Enclosure C, RG 218 Records of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Central Decimal File, 1961, Box 165, FN CCS 9122-2000 Central America (18 Sept. 1961), 3586. NARA II; and ibid., 3583.

The Joint Chiefs preferred training directed by U.S. armed forces personnel "in country." Since the 1940s, the Joint Chiefs emphasized as a matter of policy the training supplied by MAAGs, missions, and even military attachés to U.S. embassies in the region. Speaking for the Joint Chiefs, Chairman General Lemnitzer argued in JCSM 832-61 that "training should take place in their home countries." A January 30, 1962, memorandum to the Special Group (CI) from General Lemnitzer detailed the wide array of U.S. service academies, schools, and colleges that provided the latest on "military training in counterinsurgency . . . as it pertains to MAAG, mission, and attaché assignments." The most important of these, not surprisingly, was the Special Warfare Center at Ft. Bragg, which had undergone significant expansion in 1961 to accommodate the increased attention to counterinsurgency training in addition to the unconventional and psychological warfare training programs already in place.[191]

Ideally, the Defense Department wanted to use Special Forces "Mobile Training Teams to train indigenous small, efficient, and mobile 'brushfire' units for internal security problems." A review of the 7th Special Forces activities in Columbia by the Strategic Army Command recommended that "all MTT phased into South America attend" the counterinsurgency course at Ft. Gulick as well as at the Jungle Warfare Center. In 1963, Ft. Sherman closed and Ft. Gulick took over Jungle training. The army

---

[191] Lemnitzer to President Kennedy, JCSM 832-61, Appendix B, "Military Actions for Latin America – Part II," 1; Lt. Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair JCS) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, CM 530-62, 30 Jan. 1962, "Training Related to Counter-Insurgency Matters, (U)," Attachment, "Military Training in Counterinsurgency and Related Matters as it Pertains to MAAG, Mission, and Attaché Assignments," NSF, M & M, Box 319, FN Spec. Group (CI), Military Training Report, 1/30/62, 1-44; and ibid., 5-6.

assigned "elements of the 7th Special Forces Group . . . to the Canal Zone in order to give CINCARIB an immediate pool of qualified personnel to participate in training of indigenous forces in counterinsurgency and other related operations, i.e., civic action, psychological warfare, counter-guerrilla warfare, and anti-subversion." In 1963, the U.S. Army established 8th Special Forces with headquarters at Fort. Gulick. Mobile Training Teams accounted for the majority of internal security training in Latin America in 1962. Only 435 foreign military received training at U.S. facilities in 1961, and of those only seventy five came from the "western hemisphere." Europe, for example, had only sixty-one students in fiscal year 1961 and Iran had more than all of Europe. Vietnam sent more students to the U.S. school than Europe and the Middle East combined. But in 1962, the United States trained more Panamanian National Guardsmen than they did soldiers from Vietnam. The United States sent more advisors to Laos in 1962 to train that nation's military in the latest counterinsurgency doctrine than were sent to the rest of the world.[192]

---

[192] Hayden Williams (Dep. ASD/ISA) to Gen. Maxwell Taylor (Chair Spec. Group CI), memorandum, 2 Mar. 1962, "Report on Participation of U.S. and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment o Common Objectives in Latin America," Appendix B, Annex A, "Ideas Being Considered for Possible Development and Future Submission," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118—JCS Proposal, Tab B, Annex c, 4-33, 7; Col. R. H. Moore (Exec. SACSA) to Special Group (CI), memorandum, "Report of Visit to Colombia, South America, by a Team from Special Warfare Center, Fort Bragg, North Carolina (U)"; Kennedy Presidential Library; Hugh Gardner, 15 Apr. 1968, USARSO, "Jungle Warfare Training in the Canal Zone," HMF 2-017, 13. CMH; Hayden Williams (Dep. ASD/ISA) to Gen. Maxwell Taylor (Chair Spec. Group CI), memorandum, 2 Mar. 1962, "Report on Participation of U.S. and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America," NSF, NSAM, Box 333, FN NSAM 118-JCS Proposal – Tab A-1 – A-14, 3/62, Tab A-3. Kennedy Presidential Library; and USARSO, 8th Special Forces Group, 1st Special Forces, Special Action Force Latin America, Historical Supplement, 1968-69, HMF 2-088. CMH; and Roswell Gilpatric (Dep. Sec. of Def.) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, 5 June 1962, "Department of Defense Report on NSAM 131 – Training Objectives for Counter-Insurgency," Annex B, "Number of Foreign Students Attending Counter-Insurgency Courses in the CONUS and Overseas by Fiscal Year," NSF, NDSM, Box 334, FN 131 – Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency, Memoranda 6/1-6/4/62, 1-5. Kennedy Presidential Library.

Few countries, however, responded to USARCARIB School offerings. Panama regularly sent National Guard cadres, and forty-nine Costa Rican and nearly a score Nicaraguan and Honduran police each finished courses at Ft. Gulick. Relatively few Latin American military took advantage of military intelligence (28), counterinsurgency (87), or ranger (1) training at either Ft. Gulick or Ft. Bragg in 1962. Furthermore, only a handful of U.S. military trainers went especially to Latin American nations to provide internal security instruction. Instead, Mobile Training Teams accounted for the bulk of counterinsurgency and military intelligence training. Teams went to all the Central American countries, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic. These teams could have a pronounced impact. MTTs to Guatemala established a Special Warfare School that trained the nation's military and provided police their weapons and riot control training. Troops trained by the Special Forces teams helped the embattled President Ydigoras fend off yet another coup attempt in early February that was led by troops trained at the USARCARIB School. Perhaps that is why Roger Hilsman told officers at Ft. Benning in May 1962 that "guerrilla forces inside and outside Guatemala at present constitute only a minor threat to the country's internal security."[193]

---

[193] Dallam "Progress Report," Inclosure 1, "Progress Report," 1-5. NARA II; Roswell Gilpatric (Dep. Sec. of Def.) to McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA), memorandum, 5 June 1962, "Department of Defense Report on NSAM 131 – Training Objectives for Counter-Insurgency," Annex B, "Number of Foreign Students Attending Counter-Insurgency Courses in the CONUS and Overseas by Fiscal Year," NSF, NDSM, Box 334, FN 131 – Training Objectives for Counterinsurgency, Memoranda 6/1-6/4/62, 5. Kennedy Presidential Library; Dallam, "Progress Report," 6. NARA II; ibid., 1-5. See also Michael McClintock, Strategies of Statecraft: U.S. Guerrilla Warfare, Counter-Insurgency, and Counterterrorism, 1940-1990 (New York: Pantheon, 1992), 187-8; Child, Unequal Alliance, 408; Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks, The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence (London: Jonathan Cope, 1971), 124; and Barber and

The region as a whole did not bristle with steely-eyed revolutionaries. Despite the "revolution of rising expectations" underway in Latin America, the region did not represent a great threat to the security of the United States in the first three years of the Kennedy administration. "Apolitical rural-based bandits" plagued the Colombian countryside who "for their own purpose, have helped prevent the expansion of communist-controlled enclaves." The Caribbean Command kept tabs on the political, economic, and social dynamics of each of the countries under its watch and in early 1963 the Commanding General issued a report to the Joint Chiefs assessing the threat level in each of the seventeen Latin American countries. The Caribbean Command reported that, in Bolivia, Victor Paz Estenssoro utilized his own Tiger Brigade, former cadets trained by U.S. Special Forces, to arrest a number of opposition party leaders who had been agitating after the fraudulent summer 1962 elections. Political and economic difficulties marked Argentina, Chile, and Brazil, but no subversive threat existed outside of a few peasants agitating in northeast Brazil. Ecuador "experienced considerable political unrest" due to the "personal instability" of the nation's president, Carlos Julio Arosemena. El Salvador, a staunch ally against Cuba, "contained and probably reduced" the subversive threat because the "government did not hesitate to use strong repressive

---

Ronning, Internal Security and Military Power, 99. Roswell Gilpatric (ASD/ISA) to President Kennedy, memorandum, 11 Apr. 1963, "Capability of Guatemalan Government to Control Riots," NSF, Country Files, Guatemala, Box 101 FN General 4-7/63, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library. Quoted in George Ball (Acting Sec. Inter-American Affairs) to CINCARIB, telegram, #A-1, 16 Mar. 1962, RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Decimal Files, 1960-63, Box 1508, FN 711F.00/11-260, 1. NARA II; and Lt. Col. George Hardgrove (Dir. Infantry School) to Roger Hilsman (ASS/IR), letter, 12 June 1962, Hilsman, Subj., Box 6, papers, FN Communist Insurgency, 5/62, 8. Kennedy Presidential Library.

measures against the communists." The Special National Intelligence Estimate of November 9, 1962 advised President Kennedy that "Castro's efforts, with Soviet help . . . have not produced significant results." Instead, the report argued that the "dangerously unstable situation that prevails throughout much of Latin America is the product of fundamental inequalities and historic circumstances; it is not the creation of Castro and the Soviets." Still, on February 18, 1963, Kennedy authorized his staff to push Congress for more Military Assistance Program monies to counter Cuban subversion and then formalized on March 15, 1962 a broad-ranging effort to isolate Castro from the rest of Latin America, including plans to fingerprint travelers going from Mexico to Cuba, harassment of Cuban officials, and continued "U.S. sea and air surveillance of the Caribbean area contiguous to Cuba." That spring, Kennedy also resumed the clandestine campaign against Castro while the Special Group (CI) abjured U.S. military and diplomatic personnel to dissuade Latin Americans from their penchant for jets.[194]

---

[194] Hardgrove to Hilsman, letter, 12 June 1962, 8. Kennedy Presidential Library; Macon A. Hipp, Headquarters, Caribbean Command, "Caribbean Command Annual History, 1962," Annex B, "Central and South America," HMF. 8-2A.8 AA 1962, 1-38. CMH; ibid., 3; ibid., 7-9; ibid., 16; ibid., 20; John H. McCone (Dir. CIA) to President Kennedy, memorandum, SNIE 85-4-62, 9 Nov. 1962, "Castro's Subversive Capabilities in Latin America," Item #102, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 234-5; Joseph A Califano, Jr. (Spec. Asst. Sec. of the Army), memorandum, 18 Feb. 1963, "Meeting with The President on 18 February 1963," Item #105, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 238-9; Cyrus Vance (Sec. of the Army) to Robert McNamara, memorandum, 15 Mar. 1963, "Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee of Cuban Affairs: Movement of Subversives and Subversive Trainees," Item #107, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 242-7; John Giglio, The Presidency of John F. Kennedy (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1991), 219; Warren Hincle and William W. Turner, The Fish Is Red: The Story of the Secret War Against Castro (New York: Harper & Row, 1981), 192-219; and Department of State, circular telegram, 1491, 27 Feb. 1963, "Military Assistance for Internal Security in Latin America," Item #106, Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, vol. XII, American Republics, 241 came at the direction of McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to NSC, memorandum, NSAM 206, 4 Dec. 1962, "Military Assistance for Internal Security in Latin America," NSF, NSAM, Box 338-9, FN NSAM 206, 1. Kennedy Presidential Library.

**RHETORIC AND REALITY**

John F. Kennedy saw the Cuban Revolution as part of Moscow's latest attack on freedom in the west. For Kennedy, Khrushchev's declaration in support of "wars of national liberations," Castro's May 1, 1961 commitment to socialism and dictatorship in Cuba, and the publication of Ché Guevara's Guerrilla Warfare were all manifestations of war in the Western Hemisphere. To meet that threat, Kennedy launched a massive reorientation of the United States defense posture. The abrupt dismissal of the hemispheric defense posture that characterized the Eisenhower administration reflected a comprehensive shift to implement counterinsurgency doctrine in every part of U.S. armed forces' training. For Walt Rostow, counterinsurgency training possessed the dual function of thwarting Communist subversion while helping the Latin American military to preserve the internal security necessary for the underdeveloped economies of the region to respond to the economic stimulus of the Alliance for Progress. The Alliance for Progress, however, never amounted to much. The Kennedy administration forged ahead with the instruments of development: the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and the insistence on civic action in all military training. The reality of Latin American military-social relations, however, muted the impact of those agencies on the region. That's why the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in September 1962 characterized the paltry civic action efforts in Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Paraguay, and Uruguay as "compatible with their [the military's]

potential." Instead, the military of Latin America embraced counterinsurgency as a means to preserve internal security against Cuban-sponsored subversion.[195]

The USARCARIB School initially seemed like the best resource to upgrade the Latin American military in counterinsurgency doctrine. The secretary of the army touted the USARCARIB School as the best locus for the new push to bring the underprepared Latin American military into consonance with new military policy for the hemisphere. But, instead, the USARCARIB School quickly faded into the background despite its initial salience and decided training advantages. The classes at Ft. Gulick and Ft. Bragg in the summer of 1961 proved to be but the first of a broad range of training in all facets of Defense and State Department activities. And the Joint Chiefs of Staff wanted to keep direct control of internal security training. By early 1963, the United States military had made the necessary adjustments; America was ready to meet the threat of irregular warfare. The JCS deemed that most of the region's militaries already possessed the requisite professionalism and material readiness to stymie the inconsistent and generally pitiful revolutionary movements that rarely flared in the early 1960s. Now that proper training had appropriately reoriented a generation of Latin American officers toward internal security, thanks to the able assistance of U.S. advisors, they could do the job.

---

[195] Jerome Levinson and Juan de Onis, The Alliance that Lost Its Way (Chicago: Quadrangele, 1970), remains the most detailed analysis of the failed Alliance for Progress. See also Diane B. Kunz, Butter and Guns: America's Cold War Economic Diplomacy (New York: The Free Press, 1997), 120-48; William O. Walker, III, "Mixing the Sweet with the Sour: Kennedy, Johnson, and Latin America," in The Diplomacy of the Crucial Decade: American Foreign Relations during the 1960s, ed. Diane B. Kunz (New York: Colombia University Press, 1994), 49-57; and Rabe, Most Dangerous Area, 147-72; and Lt. Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer (Chair JCS) to Robert McNamara (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, JCSM 704-62, 13 Sept. 1962, "Participation of US and Latin American Armed Forces in the Attainment of Common Objectives in Latin America (U)," NSF, NSAM, Box 335, FN NSAM 140, 5. Kennedy Presidential Library.

Colombia and Ecuador, along with Central America and the Caribbean, however, needed considerable help. In the 1950s, the Joint Chiefs preferred its own military missions and MAAGs assigned to embassies to assess military and security threat levels in various nations and to provide any training the U.S. deemed necessary. In the 1960s, that practice underwent a marked shift as Special Forces groups, trained at the Special Warfare College at Ft. Bragg, undertook assignments as needed on a case-by-base basis. For the Joint Chiefs, these Mobile Training Teams had already begun to make significant inroads in rectifying the doctrinal imbalance. And while the newly anointed U.S. Army School of the Americas had incorporated counterinsurgency training – for the specific purpose of maintaining internal security – into every aspect of its curriculum, the U.S. Army did its best to return the school to its previous fringe role within the training regime of the United States military.

President Kennedy kept up the public face on his Latin American policy in mid-February 1963 when he declared that "Latin America is the most critical area in the world today." But his advisors had concurred the previous November that Cuba posed no immediate threat. Latin America had been trained, and the requisite systems had been put in place to deal with dissidents. So the administration turned to the growing trouble in Southeast Asia. Rural and urban guerrilla movements did emerge from time to time in Latin America after the Cuban Revolution. During the 1960s, and on into the 1970s and 1980s, authorities in Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, Uruguay, and most notably in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua, battled leftists of many different persuasions for the hearts and minds – or at least obedience – of their countrymen. Those movements

developed amidst a powerful era of change, in which social expectations fractured under the weight of transistor radios, child immunizations, and mosquito abatement programs.[196]

The resulting massive rural to urban movement has forced elites in every country in the region, with varying degrees of success, to develop new constructs in a fight to maintain their asymmetrical social, political, and economic position. Fidel Castro remains a "thorn" in the side of American imperial prestige. But the ability of Castro to export his revolutionary ideology or his tactics proved extremely limited. Perhaps most important, the fitful and often hopelessly divided revolutionary movements that did manage to make a name for themselves succeeded all too well in forging solidarity amongst the one institution pledged to defending la patria: the military. The strident rhetoric of revolutionaries never matched their battlefield successes and only spawned waves of brutal, staunchly anti-Communist authoritarian dictatorships.[197]

---

[196] Press conference reported in NYT, 13 Feb. 1963, p. A1. col. 4. See Ché Guevara, Guerrilla Warfare, eds. Loveman and Davies (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1985), 182-419; and Timothy Wickham-Crowley, Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America: A Comparative Study of Insurgents and Regimes since 1950 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 67-8.

[197] Alfred Stepan, Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988); Frederick Nunn, The Time of the Generals: Latin American Professional Militarism in World Perspective (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992); Loveman, La Patria; Ché Guevara, Guerrilla Warfare, eds. Loveman and Davies; Wickham-Crowley, Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America; and Barber and Ronning, Internal Security.

# Chapter 5:

## Human Rights at the "School of Assassins":

## The U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1964-2001

The Kennedy administration fundamentally altered the discourse of U.S. policy toward Latin America. The Alliance for Progress rested on the assumption of Walt Rostow and others who argued that traditional ways of life trapped underdeveloped societies of the world in primitive patterns of behavior that seemed to satisfy historical necessities while effectively stifling the transition to modernity. Hence, the United States needed to jump start this process and shift the underdeveloped regions – Latin America especially – back onto the natural evolution of the development process. In short, U.S. policy needed to create the requisite social and political conditions necessary for their progression to the next "stage of development."[198] The Alliance for Progress, launched with such fanfare and rhetorical flourish, failed miserably. Latin Americans eager for U.S. aid and the trappings of modernity – automobiles, airplanes, and air pollution – embraced Kennedy's vision. But La Alianza, as it was called, dwindled rather quickly in the face of administrative neglect, the lack of Congressional mandate – money – and compelling issues elsewhere that simply turned President Kennedy's gaze away from

[198] See Max F. Millikin and Walt W. Rostow, A Proposal: Key to an Effective Foreign Policy (New York: Harper, 1957); Dankwart Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy: Toward A Dynamic Model," Comparative Politics vol. 11 no. 3 (Apr. 1970), 337-363; Robert Alan Dahl, Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), 1-47; Samuel P. Huntington, "Will More Countries Become Democratic?" Political Science Quarterly vol. 99 no. 2 (Sum. 1984), 193-218 for the persistence of

Latin America with increasing frequency. Nevertheless, Rostow had implanted in the consciousness of the United States government a new term, a new concept: development. Since 1963, the style and occasionally the substance of U.S. policy toward Latin America has shifted with each presidency, but the underlying premise has not. Each successive president of the last four decades has sought, in some way, to promote economic development in the region. The language has evolved, and now the United States refers to helping the region achieve "sustainable" development. But each president has in turn been forced to address, directly, the tradeoff between preserving the internal security that proponents of development crave and promoting democracy in a region better known for anti-democratic military dictatorships. During the cold war, anti-Communism usually decided the issue.

The U.S. Army School of the Americas generally did not play a significant role in providing internal security training to Latin America in the two decades that followed the death of John F. Kennedy. The Military Assistance Program continued to serve as the primary vehicle for military aid and training to the region, and the school provided courses per MAP dictates. The army still preferred the service schools in the United States, and the Department of Defense used Mobile Training Teams to target specific security threats. For the next twenty years, the school receded further in significance within the U.S. Army training regimen. So, too, did Latin America dwindle in importance to the United States. First the engrossing war in Southeast Asia robbed

---

this view; and Walt W. Rostow, The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).

energy from U.S.-Latin American policy, and then the subsequent fallout of the Vietnam War led critics of internal security training by the end of the 1970s to seriously challenge the school's existence. And throughout the cold war, the Soviet Union loomed paramount in policy considerations. Successive presidential administrations struggled to forge a détente with the USSR while managing the nuclear arms race. In the meantime, waves of enduring authoritarian – meaning anti-Communist – dictatorships swept through Latin America in the early and late 1960s and then again in the early and mid 1970s. U.S. private investment in Latin America grew at unprecedented rates in the 1970s, and American policymakers spoke of the power of trade to gradually wean the region away from its dependency on military regimes. The United States did not include the School of the Americas as a part of policy deliberations in any meaningful way until Central American dominos seemed poised to fall in the early 1980s. To circumvent congressional restrictions on military aid, the Reagan administration used the school at Ft. Gulick to train thousands of Nicaraguan Contras and El Salvadoran regular army and special forces units. The widespread atrocities perpetrated by many of these soldiers led critics of President Reagan's Central American policy to dub Ft. Gulick the "School of Assassins."[199] The school moved to Ft. Benning, Georgia, in 1984, but it has struggled since to move beyond the legacy of those few years.

[199] "School of Americas, School of Assassins," (New York: Maryknoll World Productions, 1994), 20 min., Video.

**BACK TO THE BENCH**

United States policy toward Latin America shifted by early 1964. Lyndon Johnson was now the president, and Latin America did not hold the same fascination for him. A political creature par excellence, however, President Johnson appreciated even more than his former boss the domestic political fallout of international failures. And he was determined not to have his administration fail to contain Communism anywhere in the world, let alone the Western Hemisphere. Consequently, Johnson reacted to the growing populism of Brazilian President João Goulart with alarm and offered U.S. military aid to assist the Brazilian military with his ouster in April 1964. The Brazilian generals did not need the help, but Johnson followed with a substantial military aid program that escalated an already close relationship between the United States and the Brazilian military and helped cement authoritarian rule in that country for decades. A year later, Johnson grossly overreacted to instability in the Dominican Republic by sending 22,000 U.S. troops. The president deliberately misled Congress and the American people about the degree of Communist subversion there and the threat to American property on the Caribbean island nation. But he was willing to do whatever it took to assure himself of one thing: there would be no more Cubas on Lyndon Johnson's watch. And the invasion did manage to ease congressional opposition to Military Assistance Program internal security aid. With the 1965 appropriations, Congress modified section 511(b) to read, "to the maximum extent feasible," military assistance will abide by agreements reached with the Organization of American States. The president now had the discretion to apply MAP money to internal security with a

minimum of paperwork. Congress did limit that aid to $55 million annually in material for the region as a whole, and no more than $25 million to any one country. Brazil received that $25 million. The following year, Congress included material and training in the 55/25 split. And, Congress put the secretary of state – not the secretary of defense – in charge of the dispensation of MAP monies.[200]

Ten new military coups had interrupted democracy in Latin America since 1961 forcing Johnson, as a matter of policy, to decide how to respond to anti-democratic forces in Latin America. The president did not wait long. Lyndon Johnson signed off on the foundation of his Latin American policy on Feb. 17, 1964. NSAM 283 institutionalized the counterinsurgency training programs established in the previous three years. The Johnson administration focused on the Military Assistance Program to provide internal security training. Thomas Mann, the new Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, did not have much faith in the Alliance for Progress. Mann, who had a long career in the State Department serving on Latin American issues and as Kennedy's

---

[200] H. W. Brands, The Limits of Globalism: Lyndon Johnson and the Limits of American Power (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Michael W. Weis, Cold Warriors and Coups d'etat: Brazilian-American Relations, 1945-1964 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1993); Ruth Leacock, Requiem for Revolution: The United States and Brazil, 1961-1969 (London: Kent State University Press, 1990); and Thomas Skidmore, Politics in Brazil, 1930-1964 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967). Abraham F. Lowenthal, The Dominican Intervention (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), [1972]; Jerome Slater, Intervention and Negotiation: The United States and the Dominican Revolution (New York: Harper & Row, 1970); Theodore Draper, The Dominican Revolt: A Case Study in American Policy (New York: Commentary Report, 1968); and Tad Szulc, Dominican Diary (New York: Praeger, 1965). Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs Under Mutual Security Act 1960, Foreign Assistance Acts 1961-1965, Parts I-IV, RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy File, 1964-66, Box 2413 FN POL 23 LA 9/11/65, 28-29. NARA II; Peter H. Smith, Talons of the Eagle: Dynamics of U.S. Latin American Relations (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 157; Department of State, AID, Latin American Internal Security Programs, 38. NARA II; and ibid., 30.

ambassador to Mexico, purged the State Department of Alliance adherents. President Johnson did not have any more patience with the Alliance for Progress than Thomas Mann, which is why the president gave him considerable latitude to oversee everyday Latin American policy. Anti-Communist stability mattered to the president and Mann believed, pragmatically in his eyes, that the Latin American military were "on the whole a pretty decent group of people" who would maintain order for the United States. Mann made the new policy clear in mid-March 1964 at a three-day meeting of U.S. ambassadors to the region when he directed those assembled to preserve U.S. property, promote opportunity for American business, and adopt a strict neutrality on anything besides Communism. Mann tapped into the history of U.S.-Latin American relations when he told reporters on March 18, 1964 that, with this new emphasis, the United States would abide by the non-intervention agreement signed in Bogotá in 1948. He echoed that point nearly three months later at Notre Dame when he remarked that the United States should "encourage democracy in a quiet, unpublicized way," and the nation could not interfere unless a regime change represented a "breach in established international conduct."[201]

---

[201] Brian Loveman, For La Patria: Politics and the Armed Forces in Latin America (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1999), 172; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to the National Security Council, memorandum, NSAM 283, 13 Feb. 1964, "U.S. Overseas Internal Defense Training Policy and Objectives," RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development, 1961-, Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74, Box 5, FN IPS 7-1 Natl. Security Council (NSA Memoranda), 1-4. NARA II; Thomas Mann, oral history, Johnson Presidential Library, in David F. Schmitz, Thank God They're on Our Side: The United States and Right Wing Dictatorships, 1921-1965 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 265; Tad Szulc, NY Times, 19 Mar. 1964, p. A1 col. 7; and in Smith, Talons of the Eagle, 157.

The U.S. Army had a new field manual especially tailored to meet the demands of NSAM 283. The special forces handbook, FM 100-20, proudly declared that counterinsurgency had become an integrated part of U.S. foreign and military policy. The standard field manual for the U.S. Army for nearly two decades, FM 100-20 grew out of the first counterinsurgency courses taught at Ft. Bragg in 1961. In January 1961, the staff at the Special Warfare Center took advantage of the U.S. Marines' small wars manual. The army officers at Ft. Bragg for that first class simply replaced the marine cover with an army cover. Just four years earlier, the U.S. Army Special Operations Research Office had noted the need for a comprehensive counterguerrilla doctrine but had failed to mention Latin America in its analysis of historical case studies. In light of the new importance of counterinsurgency, President Kennedy directed the army to produce a uniform guide on March 13, 1962 in NSAM 131. It took nearly two years and twenty versions before the army completed a satisfactory version – FM 100-20. And the army made some important changes to the counterinsurgency manual. To begin with, the 1961 manual, FM 31-21A, argued that while "susceptible to communist control and takeover," the growing "unrest" in the underdeveloped world "stems from purely nationalistic reasons which support ideals of economic and social advancement." The final draft of FM 100 emphasized instead the responsibility of the "host government since insurgency is uniquely a local problem." The earlier version stressed that "elimination of the causes of popular unrest compel a complete integration of positive political, economic, and social aid programs" to go along with military operations and aid. FM 100-20 mentioned "civic action" as one of many "military counterinsurgency measures,"

including "military training," "combat operations," "population control," and "psychological operations." The 1964 draft also dropped the pages of discussion on the "employment of chemical and biological agents" in favor of a detailed itemization of the executive departments and agencies – the Departments of Defense and Army in particular – that supervised counterinsurgency within U.S. overseas internal defense rubric. By 1964, however, the urgency that had driven the army to devise its own guidebook shifted geographically to Southeast Asia. Still, FM 100-20 reflected the institutionalization of counterinsurgency doctrine into the national security apparatus of the United States.[202]

The U.S. Army School of the Americas struggled in its usual peripheral role in the MAP training program despite the continued emphasis on internal security. In an effort to boost its image, the school wrote in the Army Digest in early 1965 that its students "develop the leadership skills so necessary in furthering the economic and national development of their respective nations." Along with its new "Library of the Americas," the school continued to emphasize counterinsurgency in all aspects of its training

---

[202] FM 100-20. The designation 20 in "FM 100-20" indicates that the twentieth draft was accepted; Lt. Col. Russell Ramsay, Ret., oral history, 18 March 1998, John B. Amos Library; Department of the Army, Special Operations Research Office, Project GWR, June 1957, Guerrilla Warfare Requirements, comp. by William Rossiter, RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Administrative Files, 1955-1962, 1957-1958 Bulky Packages, Box 269, FN AG 370.64 Oct. 21, 1957, 1-129; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to NSC, NSAM 131, 13 Mar. 1962, "Training Objectives for Counter-Insurgency," RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Box 32, FN 353, Jan.-Mar. 1962, 1; Department of the Army, field manual, FM 31-21A, 26 Sept. 1961, "Guerrilla Warfare and Special Forces Operations (U)," RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1917-, Classified Central General Administrative Files, 1955-1962, 1961 Cases, Box 426, FN AG 353 1-1-61, 9; Department of the Army, field manual, FM 100-20, 28 Jan. 1964, "Field Service Regulations Counterinsurgency (U)," RG 319 DCSOPS, Class. Corr., 1961-64, Box 3, FN 201-29, 19; Department of the Army, FM 31-21A; Department of the Army, FM 100-20, 25-30; Department of the Army, FM 31-21A, 34-48; and Department of the Army, FM 100-20, 13-24. NARA II.

including the Basic Medical Technician course. Military intelligence and jungle training continued to be staples at the U.S. Army School of the Americas through the mid-1960s, and the school added a full range of airborne training in 1964, including "basic airborne," "pathfinder," "rigger," and "jumpmaster." Amidst the spending of the Vietnam War, however, the Johnson administration looked to close the school in 1966 to save the army $3.3 million per year. The Comptroller of the Army cited duplication of effort and declining enrollment as the primary reasons for the proposed closures, and his office reported that the language school at Lackland Air Force Base could easily provide sufficient English language training at no appreciable cost. With Latin American support, the U.S. Army School of the Americas managed to keep its doors open. To bolster enrollment, the school returned to some of the basics from the 1950s when it added a full range of heavy equipment operator courses. In 1967, though, heavy equipment meant civic action – grader, crane shovel, water purification, and well drilling. But the school still struggled to fill the counterinsurgency and jungle training courses in 1967, and the army returned jungle training to Ft. Sherman on April 1, 1968. So the U.S. Army School of the Americas added "correctional administration," "physical security," and "military civic action planning" courses to the 1968 catalog, stressing "coordination of military civic action programs with civil and government agencies." That same year, Ft. Gulick offered a noncommissioned officers course on "military interrogation" for the first time." The U.S. Army School of the Americas could not emerge from its limited role because, like Kennedy, President Johnson also preferred to use mobile training teams to impart counterinsurgency training for "internal defense." The Special Action Force of

the 8th Special Forces stationed at Ft. Gulick reported in April 1965 that they had a three-year schedule of MTT missions for every country in the region, and declared that "more than any other United States Government Agency," it had helped Latin America to "remain free . . . from Communism or other totalitarian domination." Ft. Gulick mattered to President Johnson, but its longest tenant, the School of the Americas, did not.[203]

Richard Nixon began to lay the groundwork for his Latin American policy on January 21, 1969. The new president asked Nelson Rockefeller to chair a presidential commission whose task was to prescribe a new Latin American policy for the nation. Rockefeller, the son of oil magnate John D. Rockefeller, had served as assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs under Franklin Roosevelt and had continued to take a special interest in the region. Rockefeller put together a large, bi-partisan panel to study

---

[203] USARSA, "Armies Can Be Builders," Army Digest vol. 20 no. 2 (Feb. 1965), 16-19; USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1964 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1964), vi. John B. Amos Library; Medical Committee Report, Technical Department, USARSA, Inclusion #3, Command Historical Program FY 1967, U.S. Army School of the Americas, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 4-6. CMH. See 1964-1968 catalogs, USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1964-68 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1964-8). John B. Amos Library; Lincoln Gordon (Army Comptroller) to U. Alexis Johnson (Dep. Under Sec. of State), memorandum, 9 June 1966, "Draft Report of the General Accounting Office Recommending the Closing of United States Military Training Schools in the Canal Zone," Enclosure, "Potential Reduction in Training Costs to Be Realized by Training Latin American Personnel under the Military Assistance Program at United States Armed Forces Schools in the United States Rather than the Panama Canal Zone," RG 59 General Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy File, 1964-66, Box 1702, FN DEF 6-9 US 4/1/66, i and 13. NARA II; Maj. Richard J. Tchon, Maintenance Committee Report, Technical Department, USARSA, Inclusion #2, Command Historical Program FY 1967, U.S. Army School of the Americas, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1-2; History, CY 1968, Inclusion #1, U.S. Army School of the Americas, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 5. CMH; USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1968 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1968), 52-5, 61-4, and 36-8. John B. Amos Library; Disposition Form, Inclusion #1, Command Historical Program FY 1967, U.S. Army School of the Americas, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1. CMH; USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1968 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1968), 27-30. John B. Amos Library; and Col. Arthur D. Simmons (8th SF) to Maj. Gen. J. D. Alger (CGUSARSO), fact sheet, 14 Apr. 1965, "8th Special Forces Group (Abn), 1st Special Forces (Special Action Force)," RG 319 DCSOPS, Civic Action Files, 1960-65, Box 1, FN 201-36, [12]. NARA II.

the current conditions in Latin America. Another wave of authoritarian dictatorships had taken power in Latin America since 1964. Rockefeller found that Costa Rica was the only Central American nation with a relatively democratic government. Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, and Argentina had fallen to military coups and Chile and Uruguay would follow in short order. Richard Nixon, therefore, had to weigh in on the balance between stability and democracy in U.S.-Latin American policy. Before Rockefeller delivered his final report, President Nixon presaged his new policy when he spoke to reporters on July 25, 1969. In what would become known as the Nixon Doctrine, the president informed the press that the United States could no longer supply the manpower in the battle against Communism. His comments referred, of course, to U.S. military commitments in Southeast Asia. But the Nixon Doctrine reflected the new president's desire to concentrate on "big power" foreign policy with the Soviet Union and China. Nixon did not want to get bogged down in what he called the "southern tier" of the third world. While the president's desire to shift some of the military burden of the cold war represented the first stages of his policy of "Vietnamization," the Nixon Doctrine would have significant repercussions for Latin America.[204]

Nelson Rockefeller completed his assignment one month later on August 30, 1969. The Rockefeller Report on the Americas portrayed a region in crisis. The Alliance

---

[204] Nelson A. Rockefeller, The Rockefeller Report on the Americas: The Official Report of a United States Presidential Mission for the Western Hemisphere, intro. by Tad Szulc (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969), 5; Joan Hoff, Nixon Reconsidered (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 164-5; Robert S. Litwack, Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); and Raymond L. Garthoff, Detente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan (Washington: Brookings Institute, 1985).

for Progress, while noble in thought, left unfulfilled expectations. The continued staggering birth rate of the past decade meant that before the end of the 1970s more than one half of Latin America's population would be less than 19 years of age. And Fidel Castro hosted the Communist Party's Third Tri-Continental meeting in Havana in 1967. Cuban subversion had reached historic highs and threatened to ignite this incendiary situation. To overcome Communism's new threat, Rockefeller offered a grand policy that met the needs of the entire hemisphere and not just those of the United States, based on mutual respect and understanding. Rockefeller and his team pointed to the Latin American military as the primary instrument of positive change for the region. Already, Rockefeller wrote, the military as an institution had "accepted" its responsibility to "rescue" their nations from the depredations of incompetent politicians. But "a new type of military man is coming to the fore" in Latin America, and this new military man is "becoming a major force for constructive change." Rockefeller argued that this new military man is first and foremost a modernizer, having learned to "adapt his authoritarian tradition to the goals of social and economic progress." Rockefeller proposed that the United States needed to encourage the Latin American armed forces and accord them the respect their positions demanded. The United States must, Rockefeller went on, promote private investment and "mutually beneficial trade" in order for true economic development to take place. Nixon disdained foreign economic packages and preferred private investment. In the 1970s, Latin America witnessed a remarkable era of massive private investment by the leading U.S. banks that was coordinated by the Nixon administration. Perhaps forewarned, Richard Nixon directed the National Security

Council on July 9, 1969 to analyze the political future of the military establishments in Latin America. The NSC remarked that "the repeated and aggravated military assaults on the constitutional process" of the past decade were unlikely to change any time soon. The Latin American military, the president's national security advisors were told, could be the agent for economic progress in the region.[205]

The Rockefeller Report also recommended that the United States make greater use of the training facility at Ft. Gulick. The U.S. Army School of the Americas sought to capitalize on the Report's emphasis on the Latin American military as modernizers, but took care not to seem to "compete with the 15 specialized service schools in the United States." Spanish-language instruction enabled the school to provide courses specifically for Latin American military. In 1970, the School of the Americas boasted an average annual attendance of 1,600 students representing "all Latin-American nations with the exception of Costa Rica, Cuba, Haiti, and Mexico." The school noted that Brazil, Argentina, and Chile "have sophisticated military education systems and do not rely as heavily on the school as do other countries." Still, the U.S. Army School of the Americas pointed out in 1970 that its instruction enabled students "to impart their newly acquired skills to fellow nations upon return to their home countries." Venezuela's military

---

[205] Rockefeller, Rockefeller Report on the Americas, 32-3; and ibid., 75. See Barbara Stallings, Banker to the World: U.S. Portfolio Investment in Latin America 1900-1986 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), for private investment in historical perspective, and the legacy of the 1970s loan frenzy; William P. Rogers (CIA) to ARA, circular airgram, #CA-6757, 19 Dec. 1969, "The Military Establishments in Latin America," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files, 1967-1969, Political and Defense, Box 1570, FN DEF 6 1/1/67 LA, 1, Enclosures. NARA II; George C. Denney (S/INR) to Secretary of State, memorandum, 28 Aug. 1969, "The New Militarism in South America: Agent for Modernization?" RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Central Foreign Policy Files, 1967-1969, Political and Defense, Box 2287, FN DEF 6 1/1/67 LA, 1-[?]. NARA II.

academy, for example, "was originally staffed by nearly 100 graduates of the Latin American Training Center" which operated during World War II. Students could bring back a full range of internal security course work. In addition to a command grade class and a two-week component for cadets, the School of the Americas offered a four-week basic internal security course. In it, students received their MAP side arms (.38 caliber revolver and not a Colt .45 like the U.S. Army), and M14 rifles (not M16), and learned basic firearms use and maintenance. The class also taught "riot control," "demolitions," and "tactical" and "jungle operations," concluding with a two-week visit on the same "rugged course" at the Jungle Warfare Center at Ft. Sherman used to train "Vietnam-bound US personnel." The military intelligence class distinguished between internal security police activities and counterintelligence gathering, using informants and "interrogatory techniques" in order to protect "against the intelligence efforts of the enemy." The "combat interrogations" segment of the course stressed the importance of using a group of interrogators working in concert playing prisoners against each other. The 1970 catalog included a photo of a white officer conducting an interrogation of a black "captured enemy," with a ladino taking notes. The United States was teaching the Latin American military to treat their own citizens as the "enemy."[206]

---

[206] USARSA, "US Army School of the Americas," Military Review vol. 40 no. 4 (Apr. 1970), 92-3; USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1970 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1970), ii; USARSA, "US Army School of the Americas," Military Review, 93; USARSA, USARSA Catalog, 1970, 11-3; USARSA, "US Army School of the Americas," Military Review, 93; USARSA, USARSA Catalog, 1970, 128; ibid., 130; and ibid., 127. John B. Amos Library.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

U.S. internal security training facilitated a "radical transformation" of Latin American military politics. Every administration since World War II had spoken with frustration of its efforts to deny the armed services of the region expensive offensive weaponry. Lyndon Johnson echoed this in NSAM 297 when he insisted that the Defense Department avoid MAP requests for "sophisticated and expensive prestige equipment" unless truly warranted. Rather than representing simple greed for unnecessary modern military hardware or affronted Latin pride in some juvenile game of territorial competition, the Latin American military concerned themselves with invasion. While little intra-continental fighting occurred in the twentieth century, the nineteenth century had been rife with war from Mexico to the tip of South America. Generations of fighting had ingrained in Latin American military institutions the necessity of protection against foreign enemies. By the end of the 1950s, however, the Latin American military had begun an important transition. The ethos of antipolitics had for decades justified the military's place in the political process. Various generals, colonels, and other army officers (and the occasional admiral), had ousted corrupt and incompetent politicians in nearly every Latin American country many times by 1960. But the military leaders viewed these coups as interventions, temporary interruptions until they could find able and, perhaps, honorable men to assume the daily responsibilities of government. In the 1960s the focus had shifted away from external defense to protection of the fatherland against Communist subversion. And the role of the military in governing had changed. As men of enormous pride, the leaders of Latin America's military bitterly resented the

subordinate position imposed by their economies' inferiority. They eagerly embraced the view that they held the key to their nation's economic development. The officers who launched the coups from 1961-1964 and 1968-1973 did so to protect their economic futures from internal enemies, from Communist-inspired subversion. Moreover, these were not stopgap measures. The military leaders of countries throughout the region now saw themselves as the permanent solution to order and progress. They adopted a zero-sum posture in a battle for survival and then, to ensure that future, launched brutal and systematic campaigns of repression. Richard Nixon helped cement this new internal defense posture in 1973. Taking a page out of Dwight Eisenhower's playbook, Nixon used the Central Intelligence Agency to facilitate the military overthrow of Chilean President Salvador Allende in 1973. Allende offered no military challenge to the Chilean armed forces. But his mildly populist rhetoric could not be tolerated. Gerald Ford reiterated U.S. support of military intervention in 1976 when he warmly recognized the Argentina junta that later launched a vicious "dirty war" on its citizenry by "disappearing" thousands of people.[207]

---

[207] Loveman and Davies, Politics of Antipolitics, 308 advance the argument that U.S. military training prompted a qualitative shift in the political role of the Latin American military; McGeorge Bundy (Spec. Asst. NSA) to Dean Rusk (Secretary of State), memorandum, NSAM 297, 22 Apr. 1964, "Latin American Military Aid," RG 59 Records of the Department of State, Records of the Policy Planning Council (S/PC), 1963-1964, Box 243, FN National Security Action Memos (NSAM), 2. NARA II. For the nineteenth century legacy of violence, see Lieuwen, Arms and Politics, 17-35; Johnson, Military and Society, 13-92; and Robert L. Gilmore, Caudillism and Militarism in Venezuela (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1964). For discussion of the military governments of the 1960s and 1970s, see Loveman and Davies, Politics of Antipolitics, 308-14; Loveman, La Patria, 160-192, especially 189-191; Frederick Nunn, The Time of the Generals: Latin American Professional Militarism in World Perspective (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992); Edward Lieuwen, Generals vs. Presidents: Neo-Militarism in Latin America (New York: Praeger, 1964); and Lieuwen, Arms and Politics, 122-53, 229-44. See also Begnt Abrahamsson, Military Professionalization and Political Power (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972); Victor Alba, El militarismo (Mexico: UNAM, 1960); Jan Knippers Black, Sentinels of Empire: The United States and Latin American

President Jimmy Carter believed that the United States had lost too much ground in the battle for the Third World because of its unswerving support of dictators. An openly devout Christian, Carter sought to balance the nation's economic and security needs with a moral imperative. In his inaugural address, the new president declared that the United States should protect "the individual from the arbitrary power of the state." "Our commitment to human rights," he intoned, must become a "fundamental tenet of our foreign policy." The president did not invent the cause of human rights. Instead, he entered into an ongoing debate and in large part adopted the recommendations of the Linowitz Report. President Ford had commissioned Sol Linowitz to study military aid to Latin America, and the final 1976 report openly challenged the utility of supporting dictatorships simply because they were anti-Communist. The Linowitz Report contended instead that authoritarian rule in Latin America produced rebellions, and that those rebels inevitably lumped the United States in with their own brutal tyrants. Increasingly, the report argued, the United States would be forced to accept losing more countries in the hemisphere to Communism; or American presidents would have to overtly assist

---

Militarism (Westport: Greenwood, 1986); Roderick Camp, Generals in the Palacio: The Military in Modern Mexico (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); David Collier, The New Authoritarianism in Latin America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); Francía Elena Díaz Cardona, Fuerzas armadas, militarismo y constitución nacional en América latina (Mexico: UNAM, 1988); and Edward Feit, The Armed Bureaucrats: Military Administration Regimes and Political Development (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973. On the U.S. in Chile see Ernest Graves and Steven Hildreth, U.S. Security Assistance: The Political Process (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1985), 22-3; Loveman, La Patria, 187-8; Lars Schoulz, National Security and United States Policy toward Latin America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 245; and Mark T. Gilderhaus, The Second Century: U.S.-Latin American Relations since 1889 (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2000), 198-202. On Chilean politics see Arturo Valenzuela, The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Chile, ed. Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978); Nathaniel Davis, The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985); and Max Nolff, Salvador Allende: el político, el estadista (Santiago: Documentas, 1993).

repression to maintain anti-Communist states. Congress, too, had participated in the ongoing human rights debate. After placing more and more restrictions on Military Assistance Program dollars for the past several years, Congress stepped in with the 1976 International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act. In Sec. 116(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, as it was called, Congress prohibited military aid to governments who displayed a "consistent pattern of gross violations to human rights." The lawyers for the Agency for International Development wrote to the Policy Planning Council in mid July, 1977 that, according to their reading of the law, the president had "broad latitude in determining whether foreign assistance" met the specifications of the act and that the "executive branch is not precluded from imposing more stringent sanctions." When Congress singled out Argentina, Brazil, El Salvador, and Guatemala for human rights abuses the following spring, the military juntas in each country angrily rejected U.S. military aid. They felt betrayed. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance convinced the Carter administration to keep supplying economic aid as incentive for reform. The military in each country took the money and kept cracking down on their people.[208]

---

[208] James Earl Carter, Inaugural Address, 20 Jan. 1977. http://jimmycarterlibrary.org/documents/speeches/inaugadd.phtml. See also Lars Schoulz, Human Rights and United States Policy toward Latin America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981); Sol Linowitz, The U.S. and Latin America: The Next Steps (New York: Quadrangle, 1976). See also Sol Linowitz, The Americas in a Changing World (New York: Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations, 1975). House Committee on International Relations, International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act, 1976, 94th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: GPO, 1976), 20-2. See John Child, Unequal Alliance: The Inter-American Military System, 1938-1978 (Boulder: Westview, 1980), 208-12 for discussion of MAP restrictions and Congressional misgivings. Eldon Greenberg (GC/AID) to Alexander Shakow (AA/PPC), memorandum, 18 July 1977, "Human Rights-Interpretation of Section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as Amended," 3. NSARCH; Child, Unequal Alliance, 211; John H. Coatsworth, Central America and the United States: The Clients and the Colossus (New York: Twayne, 1994), 135-7; Walter LaFeber, Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America, 2d rev. ed. (New York: Norton, 1992), 210-2; Coatsworth, Central America and the United States, 135-6; and LaFeber, Inevitable Revolutions, 210-1.

The U.S. Army School languished in obscurity in the 1970s. In turn, attendance dropped in 1973 to just over 1,100 students, down from the 1600 or more in 1970. The school received updated military intelligence training materials in March 1973, not through the usual channels, but from a U.S. Army captain just returned from a brief trip to the U.S. Army Intelligence School at Ft. Huachuca, Arizona with "over one hundred (100) updated lesson plans" that the school quickly incorporated into its curriculum. The new commandant in 1974, Colonel Charles Bauer, lamented that the "senior levels" of the U.S. Army only "provided lip service to supporting the school." His predecessor, Colonel William Nairn, recalled many individualized programs of study the school designed, like the one-week course in 1971 for members of the Venezuelan general staff. In 1972, Argentina sent eighty officers for a special internal defense "orientation." The school, however, still promoted the "highly important, inherent mission . . . fostering friendly relations among the Latin American countries represented. By the mid-1970s, the U.S. Army School of the Americas began to appoint a Latin American officer as sub-commandante. In 1977, Lt. Colonel Omar Zelaya filled that role. He recalled that, regardless of the comments of "leftists" and "Jesuits," the school played an important role in "the preservation of our liberties and the democratic system." The school had to celebrate relative triumphs. For several years, the U.S. Army School of the Americas used the neighboring town of Ciricito as its civic action project, called Project 45; students from the school rebuilt the town's dock every year, held Christmas parties, and provided some basic medical care on an intermittent basis. In addition, the U.S. Army School of the Americas welcomed its first female student, Major Margarita Arango of the

Panamanian National Guard, in 1972. The next year five Bolivian women attended the Basic Medical Technician course, which now included "32 hours of internal defense instruction."[209]

The school, however, played a sporadic and ever-decreasing part in providing internal security training to Latin America as the decade wore on. Chile sent an average of 330 soldiers and officers per year between 1973 and 1975, with a peak enrollment of 479 in 1974, but it sent no students for the remainder of the decade. Over 500 Colombian military went to Ft. Gulick in 1976 for training, and that country continually had one of the highest enrollments of all of Latin America. Only Peru sent more students, on average, to Panama from South America, especially between 1974 and 1977. Panama and Nicaragua continued to set the pace for the Central American countries, with Nicaragua nearly tripling (213) its average annual (72.4) total in 1978. In the first thirty years of operation, no country sent more military to Ft. Gulick than Nicaragua, 4,673. This was 50 percent higher than the four countries who shared the spot next highest on

---

[209] Historical Summary, CY 1973, Inclusion #5, U.S. Army School of the Americas, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1; Historical Summary, CY 1972, Inclusion #1, U.S. Army School of the Americas, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 11. CMH; Col. Charles J. Bauer to Capt. James Daniels, letter, Feb. 1998; Col. William Nairn, Ret. to Capt. James Daniels, letter, Feb. 1998. John B. Amos Library; Historical Summary, CY 1972, Inclusion #1, U.S. Army School of the Americas, 6; Historical Summary, CY 1974, Inclusion #5, U.S. Army School of the Americas, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1-5; "Preservación de nuestras libertades y el sistema democrático," in letter from Col. Omar Zelaya to Capt. James Daniels, letter, Feb. 1998. John B. Amos Library; Tchon, Maintenance Committee Report, Inclusion #2, Command Historical Program FY 1967, 1-2; Medical Committee Report, Technical Department, USARSA, Inclusion #3, Command Historical Program FY 1967, U.S. Army School of the Americas, 4-6; Historical Summary, CY 1970, Inclusion #2, U.S. Army School of the Americas, File 228.01, HRC 352 Schools -- U.S. Army School of the Americas, 6-7; Historical Summary, CY 1971, 8-10; Historical Summary, CY 1972, Inclusion #1, 6-7; and Historical Summary, CY 1973, Inclusion #5, 5-6; and Historical Summary, CY 1972, Inclusion #1, U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1 and 7; and Historical Summary, CY 1973, Inclusion #5, U.S. Army School of the Americas, 1. CMH.

the list, Panama, Venezuela, Colombia, and Bolivia with 3000 or so students. Unfortunately, the historical record does not indicate what courses students from various countries attended. But the peak enrollment between 1973 and 1979 of each country listed above corresponded with heightened domestic tensions within the country in question. By contrast, only a handful of students (9) from Brazil went to Ft. Gulick for training between 1973-1976 and, after the special 1972 course, Argentina sent only a total of forty-seven servicemen. Part of the decline can be traced to Carter administration policy. Congress had eliminated training for Argentina, Brazil, El Salvador, and Guatemala in 1977 for human rights standards, and Chile and Uruguay in 1978, and Paraguay in 1979, also lost their certification. Available course work at the school underwent significant alterations by 1976. Even before the Congressional action, internal security had ceased to be a priority at the School of the Americas. By 1976, the internal defense department was gone and students at Ft. Gulick had found more management classes. Latin American military attending the School of the Americas could still take courses in "small unit" warfare and take part in "combined" operations with the Jungle Warfare Center at Ft. Sherman. But the 1977 course catalog had courses in military intelligence, psychological operations, and jungle warfare lined out, with the notation "by presidential directive." President Carter eliminated internal security training at the school. An unusually high number of Nicaraguan National Guard, however, attended the school in 1978.[210]

---

[210] Maj. Milton Menjivar, "The U.S. Army School of the Americas and Its Impact on U.S.-Latin American Military Relations in the 1980s," masters thesis, Leavenworth: Command and General Staff

Revolution in Central America led Jimmy Carter by 1979 to shift more to the security-oriented policy of his cold war predecessors. While the president initially sought to ease Nicaraguan strongman Anastasio Somoza Debayle out of office in the hopes of preventing a FSLN takeover, Carter quickly moved to isolate the Sandinista leadership after its victory. Unchecked and rampant violence in El Salvador threatened further instability. Congressional opponents of U.S. support for anti-Communist dictatorships responded to the growing unrest with new attacks on the Military Assistance Program. Senator Frank Church, Democratic Chair of the Senate Sub-Committee on Inter-American Affairs, first attacked the accepted rationale for internal security aid in 1969. Taking up the fight of Wayne Morse, Church argued that military regimes only destabilized Latin America. After his trip to Cuba in August 1977, Senator Church recommended to the full Foreign Relations Committee that the United States needed to wean Castro away from the Soviet Union, thereby eliminating Cuba as a cipher in hemispheric insurgency. In the House of Representatives, Congresswoman Pat Schroeder attacked the Military Assistance Program and internal security aid and training. In the aftermath of the Vietnam War, she argued that military aid not only wedded the United States to authoritarian dictators, it left the nation open to being drawn into "another Vietnam" in order to protect the security of our erstwhile allies. Carter's

---

College, 1979, 27, Table 2, "USARSA Enrollment, 1973-1979"; USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1980 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1980), vi. John B. Amos Library; Menjivar, "U.S. Army School of the Americas," Table 2, "USARSA Enrollment, 1973-1979," USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1976 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1976), vi; and USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1977 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1977). John B. Amos Library.

election had led, briefly, to a qualitative shift in the formulation and practice of U.S. foreign policy that had immediate repercussions for Latin America. But by 1979, Jimmy Carter was following the realpolitik advice of his National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezenski. The restive populations in the eastern Caribbean, the growing unrest in El Salvador, and open Cuban ties to the Nicaraguan revolution, led the human rights activist to shift back toward the regional security doctrine of the cold war.[211]

**THE NEW COLD WAR**

The election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 ushered in the New Cold War. Avuncular and adept at presenting himself on television, President Reagan consciously worked to restore the perception of the United States both at home and abroad as a world power. Reagan openly embraced the tried and true anti-Communism of the 1950s and relied on stark dichotomies of good and evil to forge his foreign policy. He found such a battle in Central America. The Reagan administration launched the counterattack on Communism on February 23, 1981 with the State Department "White Paper" entitled "Communist Interference in El Salvador." The White Paper starkly portrayed the tiny, embattled nation of El Salvador as but the latest prey of aggressive, expansionistic international

---

[211] See John Booth, The End and the Beginning: The Nicaraguan Revolution (Boulder: Westview, 1982); Robert Pastor, Condemned to Repetition: The United States and Nicaragua (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987); and James Dunkerly, Power in the Isthmus: A Political History of Modern Central America (London: Verso, 1988), 221-66. For the American response see Coatsworth, Central America and the United States, 137-46; LaFeber, Inevitable Revolutions, 162-6, 225-42; and Leonard, Central America and the United States, 169-74; Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Inter-American Affairs, U.S. Military Policies in Latin America, 1969, 87th Cong., 2d sess. (Washington: GPO, 1969), 1-8; Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Delusion and Reality: The Future of U.S.-Cuba: Report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Frank Church on His Trip to Cuba, Aug. 8-11, 1977, 95th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: GPO, 1977); and Pat Schroeder, U.S. Defense: What Can We Afford? (Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1980).

Communism. Cuban perfidy through its minions in Nicaragua had subverted the genuine desires of the Salvadoran people. Daniel Ortega and the Sandinistas in neighboring Nicaragua thinly masked their totalitarian intensions with nationalistic and libertarian rhetoric that did nothing to change the fact that they represented this generation's Cuba, and nothing more. The Reagan administration claimed there were direct ties between Salvadoran insurgents and Soviet-controlled Eastern Europe. Communism was on the march to the U.S. border; the Dominos were falling in Central America. The Reagan administration effectively made policy of the 1980 conservative treatise by the self-proclaimed Committee of Santa Fe. In 1980, five leading southwestern ranchers, and leaders of the so-called "sage brush rebellion," penned a polemic that warned of a renewed Soviet effort to exploit regional tensions by launching Cuba subversion to destabilize the region, particularly Central America. Dismissive of critics, who explained the Marxist-Leninist-Guevarist line of the Salvadoran insurgents as a response to cruel and brutal military regimes funded and trained by the United States, the president and his advisors argued that U.S. support of dictatorships preserved the nation's security. In this, the Reagan administration echoed Georgetown professor of political science Jeane J. Kirkpatrick. Professor Kirkpatrick frankly castigated the Carter administration for what she characterized as its unrealistic and dangerous sophistry. Kirkpatrick echoed Francis Adams Truslow, who sternly admonished the Truman administration in 1949: "Totalitarianism we refuse to cooperate with . . . with dictatorships we will." Kirkpatrick made the same argument, that United States security required support for undemocratic "authoritarian" regimes that opposed Communism and continued efforts to oust anti-

democratic "totalitarian" states that followed the Communist line. President Reagan found the distinction rather useful, rewarded Jeane Kirkpatrick with the Ambassadorship to the United Nations, and made anti-Communism in Central America the cornerstone of his Latin American policy. El Salvador would be the proving ground for the Reagan presidency; there would be no more Nicaraguas.[212]

Ronald Reagan's El Salvador policy paradoxically originated in the last months of Jimmy Carter's administration. El Salvador had languished under a series of military governments since 1948. The blatant fraud in the 1977 election that elevated Carlos Humberto Romero to power, and the repression of opposition that followed, had led Jimmy Carter to launch his first arms embargo against a Central American dictator. Carter's economic aid, however, failed to persuade the Salvadoran military to implement any reforms aimed at undercutting rebel support. The resignation of the last in a series of increasingly repressive military juntas in January 1980 only opened the door to a decade of civil war and periodic anarchy. In a hideously surreal version of the "wild west," military death squads roamed the country settling scores, including the very public assassination of Archbishop Oscar Romero in March 1980. The press in the United States took notice later that December when four American women, three nuns and a lay

---

[212] Department of State, Special Report No. 80, 23 Feb. 1981, Communist Interference in El Salvador (Washington: GPO, 1981); Committee of Santa Fe, "A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties," by Francis Bouchey, Roger Fontaine, David Jordan, Gordon Sumner, and Lewis Tambs, 1980; Francis Adams Truslow, "Study Group Reports, Inter-American Affairs," 7 Feb. 1949, Report of Groups, vol. XVI-D, Council on Foreign Relations, New York City, quoted in LaFeber, Inevitable Revolutions, 105; and Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Dictatorships and Double Standards: Rationalism and Reason in Politics (New York: Touchstone, 1982). The core argument was originally published in Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, "Dictatorships and Double Standards," Commentary vol. 68 no. 3 (Nov. 1979), 34-45.

worker, were raped and murdered by members of another military death squad. The Carter administration suspended economic aid from the United States. The end of 1980, however, witnessed the union of several disparate guerrilla groups under the rubric the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front, which launched a poorly conceived "final offensive" in the first days of 1981. In the last days of his presidency, Carter resumed economic and military aid to the Salvadoran military. Ronald Reagan stepped that up significantly in March. The failed offensive also galvanized the El Salvadoran military. Beginning in December 1981, members of the Salvadoran Atlacatl Battalion began a systematic annihilation of entire villages and towns in the northern half of the Morazan province. An elite, U.S.-trained force, the Atlacatl Battalion sought to wipe the area clean, "limpieza," in a scorched-earth policy in which the mass slaughter of civilians became de rigueur. The most notorious attack occurred in and around the town of El Mozote where, among other atrocities, soldiers filled a convent with over 150 children under the age of twelve and executed them with their U.S.-issued M16 rifles. The Reagan administration insistently claimed that the reports of massacres were just rebel propaganda and blamed the FMLN for any civilian deaths. Despite their initial success in denying a connection between U.S. counterinsurgency training and any atrocities committee by the Salvadoran army, the fighting in El Salvador brought the U.S. Army School of the Americas into the center of U.S. foreign policy for the first time.[213]

---

[213] Marvin Gettleman, et al., eds., El Salvador: Central America in the New Cold War (New York: Grove Press, 1981), has compiled a thorough survey of published documents that frame U.S. policy toward the violence in El Salvador up to 1981. For a look at the socio-economic roots of resistance in El Salvador, see Liisa North, Bitter Grounds: Roots of Revolt in El Salvador 2d ed. (Westport: Lawrence Hill, 1989);

The war in El Salvador catapulted the U.S. Army School of the Americas onto the front lines in the battle to contain Communism in Central America. Prior to 1980, El Salvador was simply one of the many countries that had availed themselves of the training offered at Ft. Gulick, sending less than one-fourth (1,116) of the number of military students that Nicaragua (4,653) sent to Panama. Four South American countries – Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, and Colombia – had sent more than 3,000 students to the school in its first thirty-five years. That all changed in 1981. Five hundred sixty-five Salvadoran military trained at Ft. Gulick. That figure represents the single greatest one-year enrollment increase in the history of the school. Most were members of an experimental rapid response unit, the Atlacatl Battalion. The Battalion officially received training through the Jungle Warfare Center at Ft. Sherman under the direction of the 8th Special Forces stationed at Ft. Gulick, but it attended classes at the School of the Americas as well. In 1982, another 587 Salvadoran military went through the school's doors and in 1983 762 soldiers and officers. Each year's total set a new record. The Salvadoran military struggled mightily in the fight against the FMLN between 1982-1984, and the training provided by the school helped the army to survive those critical years. The persistent targeting of civilian populations by elements of the El Salvadoran

---

James Dunkerly, The Long War: Dictatorship and Revolution in El Salvador (London: Verso, 1981), provides a sympathetic and detailed look at the rebellion while Michael T. Klare and Cynthia Arnson, Supplying Repression: U.S. Support of Authoritarian Regimes Abroad, foreword Richard Falk (Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1981), place El Salvador within the context of the Military Assistance Program. See also Loveman, La Patria, 192-202, for discussion of military rule; and Coatsworth, Central American and the United States, 146-57. See Mark Danner, The Massacre at El Mozote (New York: Vintage, 1994). [1993].

military, however, continued to outrage observers and a few American reporters. In turn, Reagan and his staff borrowed their lines from the El Salvadoran officer corps: nothing happened. The Reagan administration publicly acknowledged the "troubled" past of the Salvadoran military, but argued that U.S. training had raised them above that violence. Instead, the United States contended that any civilian deaths, while lamentable, came at the hands of the Marxist-Leninist rebels who sought to throw the onus onto the liberating El Salvadoran Army. Media accounts to the contrary were at best irresponsible assistance to the Communist propaganda machine. But Protestant churches, labor organizers, human rights groups, and the Catholic Church provided a wide array of evidence that the El Salvadoran military had not improved their human rights record, but had only developed better tactics to kill their own people. The increasing disconnect between the U.S. government's version of events and the growing evidence of human rights violations throughout the El Salvador forced Ronald Reagan to find some political ammunition to carry on the fight against Communism in Central America.[214]

The President's National Bipartisan Commission declared that United States security called for a sustained commitment to the cause of democracy in Central America. On July 19, 1983, Ronald Reagan formed a blue-ribbon panel of his own, led by Richard Nixon's national security advisor, Henry Kissinger. Kissinger had managed to escape the Watergate scandal relatively unscathed, and he had developed in the intervening years a certain caché among conservatives as someone who understood

---

[214] USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1981 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1981), 52. John B. Amos Library; ibid., 6; and Capt. John Paul Jones, oral history, 17 Mar. 1998. John B. Amos Library.

Communism. President Reagan expected the Kissinger Commission, as it was soon dubbed, to sanction his expanding Central American policy and provide the political momentum to expand U.S. involvement in Central America. Kissinger turned in the report that quickly bore his name on January 10, 1984. The Kissinger Commission harkened back to the Rockefeller report of fifteen years earlier, arguing that underdevelopment – and not repressive military rule – was the proximate cause for regional instability. The president had already rejected a "give away" program like the Alliance for Progress. Instead, as with the Nixon administration, Reagan wanted to encourage private investment in the region. The Commission, therefore, reiterated the tenets of the Caribbean Basin Initiative begun in January 1982. Here, the United States offered selective economic aid, usually loans from the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank, as a carrot to Caribbean nations that implemented the strict monetarist reforms his administration believed would promote American economic interests while stimulating economic development. The Commission wanted to extend that program to Central America. A renewed Communist campaign in the region, however, sought to exploit genuine desires for reform and threatened regional security. And only with security, the Kissinger Commission went on, could democracy emerge. The United States, the Commission concluded, required "multiyear funding" to marshal the necessary resources and afford the region the time it needed to promote human rights and economic development simultaneously. The United States, therefore, needed to embrace a long-term plan to promote the stability and security essential for economic development. While the Kissinger Commission reiterated the essence and particulars of

the existing strategy toward the region, the development language softened the rhetorical edge of the Reagan administration's Central American policy.[215]

The Kissinger Commission reinforced the importance of counterinsurgency training for El Salvador. The U.S. Army School of the Americas had by 1984 become an important cog in the war against Communism in El Salvador. The facilities at Ft. Gulick had been allowed to deteriorate between 1979 and 1981 when the school's future seemed in jeopardy. But after two years of physical improvements, the school readied for the coming school year with a full slate of courses reminiscent of 1962. In addition to the management courses that were a staple during the 1970s, the School of the Americas offered classes in military intelligence and psychological operations. Ranger training offerings increased along with a class in basic auto repair. The school also continued to expand its relationship with El Salvador, offering several "leadership" courses for junior officers and noncommissioned officers and three classes for cadets. The school even set up an officer's candidate class for likely Salvadoran soldiers. Despite the growing ties to the fighting in Central America, and to El Salvador in particular, Commandant Nicholas Andreacchio dismissed his school's importance outside of Panama given the U.S. Army's disdain for the facility as a whole. Colonel Andrecchio was undoubtedly correct in his assessment of the relative place of the School of the Americas within the training and doctrine command of the United States Army. But he served as commandant between

---

[215] Report of the President's National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, foreword Henry Kissinger (New York: MacMillan, 1984); Coatsworth, Central America and the United States, 167; and President's National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, 122.

1982 and 1984 when the school became an important counterinsurgency center for the Salvadoran Army. The cadet, OCS, and "leadership" courses all finished with a two-week training run through the Jungle Warfare Center. The military intelligence and psychological operations students also took part in the U.S. Army Ranger gauntlet. The School of the Americas gave the Salvadoran military the training necessary to project their forces into remote areas with unprecedented expertise as well as a new esprit. With congressional opposition to counterinsurgency training growing, the Reagan administration found the School of the Americas a useful means to promote security in El Salvador.[216]

The future of counterinsurgency training at Ft. Gulick, however, fell prey to politics. Conflict with the Panamanian government meant the end of the school in the Canal Zone. As part of the Carter-Torrijos Treaty of 1977, the United States agreed to gradually return control of the military bases in the zone to Panama. Ft. Gulick's "lease" was up in 1984. The negotiations began in 1983, but the State Department alienated Panama's president, who then insisted that his nation's flag fly above the school and that the United States Army take orders from Latin American officer as commandant. As a result, the U.S. Army decided to move the school to Ft. Benning, Georgia, the new home of the U.S. Southern Command. The move increased the prestige of the school in the eyes of Latin American students because of its new location within the United States and

---

[216] USARSA, The USARSA Catalog, 1984 (USARSA: Ft. Gulick, C.Z., 1984), 23 and 73; ibid., 24; ibid., 74; ibid., 62-6; and Col. Nicholas Andreacchio to Capt. James Daniels, letter, Feb. 1998, 2. John B. Amos Library.

on the same base as the infantry school, but it also meant that the cost of attendance increased as well. The transfer to Georgia only delayed classes for three months, and the School of the Americas continued to build its ties to El Salvador. By 1990, 6,207 members of the Salvadoran Army had studied at the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The school continued to offer several classes for El Salvadoran cadets into the early 1990s, along with the OCS course. The School of the Americas, however, had witnessed important changes by 1990. The school shifted its training emphasis away from Central America. Violetta Chamorro defeated Danial Ortega as President of Nicaragua, and the guerrillas in El Salvador entered into negotiations with the Salvadoran military that would end the fighting in that ravaged country. The school then became an important clearinghouse for Colombian troops. For the next several years, the School of the Americas made special provisions for Colombian cadet courses as more than 2,000 Colombian soldiers and officers went to Ft. Benning in the 1990s. The Bush administration was concerned with instability caused by drug cartels in Colombia. The drug war had come to the U.S. Army School of the Americas.[217]

---

[217] See Walter LaFeber, The Panama Canal: The Crisis in Historical Perspective, updated version (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 125-87 for discussion of the treaty negotiations and ratification, and 193-98 for the events of 1983-4; and Michael L. Conniff, Panama and the United States: The Forced Alliance (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 128-39, and 150 for the handover of Ft. Gulick; Andreacchio to Daniels, Feb. 1998, 4. John B. Amos Library. Christopher Dickey, "U.S. Prizes Its School for Latin American Military," Washington Post, 23 May 1983, p. A16, col. 1; Ramsay, oral history; Col. Cecil Himes to Capt. James Daniels, letter, Feb. 1998, 3; and Andreacchio to Daniels, Feb. 1998, 4. See 1986-1992 catalogs, USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1986-92 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1986-1992). John B. Amos Library. Coatsworth, Central America and the United States, 196-203; and Leonard, Central America, 192-5. And see 1988-1996 catalogs, USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1988-96 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1988-1996); and USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1997 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1997), 8. John B. Amos Library.

## THE "SCHOOL OF ASSASSINS"

The U.S. Army School of the Americas had to confront the legacy of its 1980s training just as its mission began to evolve once again. The school reformulated its curriculum for 1991, forming a new "Special Operations/Low intensity Conflict" section. As the fighting in Central America began to wane in 1987 and 1988, the United States turned its attention to a new "counternarcotics" assault. Latin American military took courses in "military intelligence" and "psychological operations," and the school arranged "commando" training with the U.S. Army Rangers at Ft. Benning. Later that year, the U.S. Army made arrangements for training with the helicopter school at Ft. Rucker, Alabama, which enabled the School of the Americas to offer another new section, the Helicopter School Battalion. Along with new courses in "computers," "advanced military intelligence," and "sniper," the school for the first time in October 1990 touted "its training and education programs [which] . . . systematically advocate human rights awareness." But the world had begun in 1990 to reexamine the fighting that had occurred in El Salvador during the 1980s. The United Nations Truth Commission revealed that the overwhelming majority of the Salvadoran Army officers who committed a continuous series of war crimes over more than a decade of civil war had received training at the School of the Americas. The United States had denied for years that the search-and-destroy operations that culminated in Morazón in late 1981 and early 1982 had ever occurred. In March 1990, the Bush administration continued to deny that the U.S. officers who trained the Immediate Reaction Battalions (BIRI), of which the Atlacatl was one, played any role in any operations, as it sought to diminish the

significance of training the Salvadoran Army did receive from the United States. But every El Salvadoran cadet class from 1970-1977 and 1980-1990 graduated from the U.S. Army School of the Americas. MTTs assigned to El Salvador established and staffed the counterinsurgency programs in San Salvador that worked with each of the five BIRIs. The special forces units assigned to the MTTs in El Salvador made use of the facilities at Ft. Sherman and at Ft. Gulick. Still, no direct evidence has been uncovered that U.S. Army officers accompanied the Salvadoran Army's cleansing campaigns. But it is clear that the Salvadoran military conceived, planned, and executed those operations using the tactics, weapons, and intelligence techniques provided by the Military Assistance Program, much of it supplied by the School of the Americas. Human rights activists who opposed U.S. military training because of the terrible costs to Central America gained the support of Congressman Joseph Kennedy and launched a movement to close the "School of Assassins."[218]

---

[218] USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1991 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1991), 37-58; ibid., 49; and ibid., 39-45. General Accounting Office, Report to the Ranking Minority Member, House Committee on National Security, GAO/NSIAD-96-178, 22 Aug. 1996, School of the Americas: U.S. Military Training for Latin American Countries, 20. http://purl.access.gpo.gov/gpo/lps30003; and USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1992 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1992), 69-90; USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1993 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1993), 33-4; USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1992 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1992), 38 and 56; USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1991 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1991), iii. John B. Amos Library. Danner, El Mozote, 155-62; and Jack Nelson-Palmeyer, School of Assassins (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997), 18-36. Col. Milton R. Menjivar to Sec. of Defense, memorandum, 20 Mar. 1990, "Congressional Inquiry -- Atlacatl Training," Rec. No. 634, "El Salvador: War, Peace, and Human Rights, 1980-1994," [Microfilm #00514], 1; Antonio J. Ramos, memorandum, 25 June 1993, "Congressional Inquiry Regarding U.S. Training of the Atlacatl Battalion, OCLL #3051549, "El Salvador: War, Peace, and Human Rights, 1980-1994," [Microfilm #00611], 1. National Security Archive. See "School of Americas" video; Nelson-Palmeyer, School of Assassins; and School of the Americas Watch at http://www.soawatch.org.

The effort to close the school gained more ammunition with the clandestine release of the School of the Americas's counterinsurgency manuals. In 1982, the U.S. Army instructed the School of the Americas to resume the military intelligence instruction that President Carter cancelled in 1977. Major Victor Tise, an instructor at Ft. Gulick, reclaimed the school's 1970s Spanish-language materials from the U.S. Army Intelligence School at Ft. Huachuca. There, the major also encountered Project X, a classified effort to adapt the lessons "learned" in the Phoenix program in Vietnam to the fighting in Central America. Major Tise noted, however, that "much" of the Project X material "came word-for-word from FM 30-18," the U.S. Army Intelligence field manual. The major combined materials from Project X with the older USARSA program to compile 382 lesson plans. The School of the Americas then sent the material to the Joint Chiefs for approval. The materials were returned unchanged and marked "approved" by the deputy chief of staff of operations. For the next several years, the School of the Americas used the manuals developed by Major Tise in its military intelligence and psychological operations courses. In 1991, a former instructor at the school released to the public copies of the seven manuals that had been in use for nearly a decade at the School of the Americas. The seven manuals covered: handling of sources; counterintelligence; analysis; revolutionary war, guerrilla and communist ideology; terrorism and the urban guerrilla; interrogation; and combat intelligence. The manuals themselves in the main read like a human resources handbook from a management seminar. But controversy quickly erupted over what the Department of Defense deemed "objectionable material inconsistent with current doctrine." The most dramatic problem

arose in volume one, handling of sources, which "refers to motivation by fear, payment of bounties for enemy dead, beatings, false imprisonment, executions, and the use of truth serum." In a March 1992 report approved by Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, the assistant secretary for intelligence oversight blasted the School of the Americas for not following established procedure by gaining approval for the military intelligence courses from Ft. Huachuca, and for assuming that the out-of-date materials gleaned in 1982 fit current doctrine. Cheney then removed the manuals for failing to meet current doctrine. The secretary openly worried that some Latin American soldiers might get the wrong idea from such dated material.[219]

The battle to close the School of the Americas continued throughout the 1990s. The School of the Americas, reluctantly, began to incorporate human rights into its curriculum by the mid-1990s to conform with emerging U.S. policy. In May 1997, the Clinton administration released "a new national security strategy for a new century." The document argued that, with the cold war over and the interconnections of the global economy drawing nations closer, the United States needed a national security policy that acknowledged the "dynamism" of the new world order. Bill Clinton argued that the United States needed to promote "sustainable development" to eliminate the underlying

---

[219] Maj. Thomas R. Husband (ADD/CI) to Deputy Assistant Sec. of Defense, memorandum, 31 July 1991, "USSOUTHCOM CI Training – Supplemental Information (U)," 1-2. Doc. 4, National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book, No. 122, http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarch/nsaebb/nsaebb122/#southcom; National Security Archive, DOD Manuals, Survey of Objectionable and Questionable Passages, http://www.gwo.edu/nsarchiv/nsa/archive/news/dodmans.htm; Werner E. Michel (ASD/IO) to Richard Cheney (Sec. of Def.), memorandum, 10 Mar. 1992, "Improper Material in Spanish-Language Intelligence Training Manuals," 2-3. Doc. 3, National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book, No. 122, http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarch/nsaebb/nsaebb122/#southcom.

pressures that bred terrorism and drug trafficking. In the Western Hemisphere, Clinton believed that the United States looked forward to an "unprecedented opportunity to build a future of stability and prosperity" with nations that were largely "democratic and committed to free market economies." The new policy fit with the legislature's plans. In 1987, a frustrated Congress had revamped the funding mechanism for U.S. military training of foreign nationals, adding the International Military Education and Training Act in 1987. The legislation required the Secretary of Defense to put on record his reasoning for providing internal security training. The act was modified in 1990 to ensure that training promoted civilian ascendancy in civil-military relations. For decades, the U.S. Army School of the Americas had included in counterinsurgency courses lectures on democracy, democratic institutions, and the relationship between the civil authorities and the military. But these were cold war lectures designed to serve as a counterpoint to Communist ideology. The school finally began in the mid 1990s to confront civil-military relations more directly. In 1994, the School of the Americas changed the Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict section to the Special Operations/Civil-Military Operations section. And in 1996, the school added a class on "democratic sustainment." The school did not deliberately incorporate human rights into the curriculum until 1997, when it held with a "train-the-trainer" human rights course designed to provide Latin American military with their own human rights instructors.

The attacks against the School of the Americas, however, continued. Congress decided to make a change.[220]

The U.S. Army School of the Americas closed its doors on December 15, 2000. Citing the changing needs of the twenty-first century, the secretary of defense deemed that the institution that had trained more than 60,000 Latin American military had served its purpose. But that was not the end of U.S. military training for Latin Americans at Ft. Benning. More than a month earlier, on October 30, 2000, Bill Clinton signed into law the National Defense Authorization Act. Section 2166 of the Act authorized the secretary of defense – and not the U.S. Army – to establish an institution to train military from qualified Western Hemisphere nations. Only countries with no continuing human rights abuses could attend and, as a matter of policy, the school screens individual applicants. The new Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation opened its doors on January 17, 2001 to promote "peace and human welfare." To coordinate training at WHINSec, as it is called, the deputy secretary of defense established in July 2002 a "visitors board," comprised of the ranking members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, the assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, the Commanding General of the U.S. Southern Command, the Commanding General of Training and Doctrine, and six members of various non-governmental organizations.

---

[220] President Clinton, May 1997, "A National Security Strategy for a New Century," 1; ibid., 18-19; ibid., 24; General Accounting Office, School of the Americas: U.S. Military Training for Latin American Countries, 9, n. 11; USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1994 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1994), 47-68; USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1996 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1996), 36; USARSA, The U.S. Army School of the Americas Catalog, 1997 (USARSA: Ft. Benning, Georgia, 1997), 48. John B. Amos Library.

Section 5.1.3.1 of the new charter compels the institute to include eight hours of "mandatory instruction" on human rights for each class offered. WHINSec now declares that it offers courses for military, police, and civilian officers from Latin America. But the new course catalog looks nearly identical to the last School of the Americas catalog, with one new addition: peace keeping. As in the 1990s, students at WHINSec can take classes in "civil-military operations" and "human rights instructor." The institute still offers a full range of cadet courses as well as a "democratic sustainment" class. The Helicopter Battalion School is gone and so are special operations. Now, U.S. Army Mobile Training Teams go to the institute to receive training in "intelligence officer," "counter drug," and "counter-narco-terrorism information officer." Very much like its predecessors, the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation seeks to emphasize the ability of training to build inter-American "relationships" and to promote "democratic values and respect for human rights." The Latin American training facility at Ft. Benning, however, does have a new motto: "paz, libertad, y fraternidad."[221]

[221] "USARSA Furls Flag, Closes Half-Century Chapter of Engagement in Hemisphere," USARSA, Main, http://carlilse-www.army.mil/usamhi/usarsa/main.htm; WHINSec, About the Institute, "About the Institute," http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec; WHINSec, About the Institute, FAQ, "Why WHINSec," http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec; WHINSec, Home page, http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec; Paul Wolfowitz (Dep. Sec. of Def.), DOD Directive, 5111.12, 17 June 2007, "Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation – Charter," WHINSec, About the Institute, Charter, http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec; WHINSec, Academics, http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec; WHINSec, Academics, Course Catalog, http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec; WHINSec, About the

# Conclusion

The United States began training Latin American military in the Panama Canal Zone in 1939. By the end of World War II, what had begun as a series of informal courtesy visits proved especially popular in Latin American military circles. The United States decided to formalize that training in 1949 when the new Caribbean Command established the USARCARIB School at Ft. Gulick on the eastern edge of the Canal Zone. Located on a base named after a retiring general who began his career in World War I on a military mission to Chile, the USARCARIB School quickly sought to establish its own identity within the U.S. Army's training system. By 1956, all instruction at Ft. Gulick was conducted in Spanish as successive commandants tried to attract more Latin American military students to the school. Time and again, however, the U.S. Army thwarted the school's efforts to expand its training beyond radio repair, heavy equipment operation, and cadet infantry classes. Dwight Eisenhower gave Latin America a limited role in maintaining hemispheric defense, which in practice meant U.S. control of the Panama Canal and the shipping lanes of the Caribbean. He did not wish to spend more money than necessary on peoples he did not trust in a comfortably secure region. Fidel Castro changed all that. The USARCARIB School took advantage of official uncertainty about the Cuban Revolution by introducing counterinsurgency training at Ft. Gulick. The school utilized the U.S. Army Ranger Jungle Warfare School across the Canal at Ft.

---

Institute, FAQ, "Why WHINSec," http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec; and WHINSec, Home page, http://www.benning.army.mil/whinsec.

Sherman. And although instructors from Ft. Gulick taught the first counterinsurgency courses for Latin American military at President Kennedy's favored Special Warfare Center at Ft. Bragg, North Carolina in January 1961, the USARCARIB School quickly faded into relative obscurity, as the president and the U.S. Army preferred to use Mobile Training Teams from the 8th Special Forces, which was also headquartered at Ft. Gulick. When the Kennedy administration renamed the facility at Ft. Gulick the U.S. Army School of the Americas on July 1, 1963, the president was trying to fill the empty classrooms at the school. After 1961, however, training at the U.S. Army School of the Americas became entwined in evolving notions of "development."

The Kennedy administration introduced the concept of underdevelopment to explain the relative economic inferiority of the non-western world. The men and women who carried out the will of successive presidential administrations accepted, usually uncritically, the assumptions of development, that traditional societies, weighed down by primitive cultural baggage and reluctant to give up the ways of the grandfathers, were in (desperate) need of an injection of modernity. Walt Rostow convinced the president that aid programs could stimulate the requisite conditions for economic development while counterinsurgency training would provide developing economies with the internal security necessary to ease them through the difficult transition period and stymie predatory Communist subversion. The course and content of policy has shifted and the style with which it manifested over time has moderated with each passing presidency. President Lyndon Johnson's staff tried to kill development spending; Nixon believed private money was the answer. Jimmy Carter tried to insist, briefly, that development

had to mean democracy as well. President Reagan forcibly sought to recreate the 1950s sense of consensus and urgency, so he used military intervention to make it happen. Democracy and development could happen later. George Bush went back to the philosophy of Richard Nixon. And Bill Clinton embraced the quest for the "open door" with a vengeance. The concept of the development process has morphed over time into "sustainable" development, and the language of development has become more politically correct, with the dropping of "primitive" and "traditional" from the lexicon. But the United States has not abandoned the fundamental assumption that development is a natural outgrowth of human progress over time. Development, in this view, *is* history. So the debate has been framed by how to promote development. And for a combination of security and economic reasons, the United States has sought to encourage development in Latin America ever since John. F. Kennedy assumed office.

The U.S. Army School of the Americas consistently portrayed its training as an opportunity for Latin American military to learn how to promote development in their own countries. Latin American military training ostensibly served to advance development policy in the years after 1961. With the notable exception of El Salvador in the early 1980s, however, the school played a deliberately limited role. Both the Johnson and Nixon administrations wanted the internal security that counterinsurgency aid and training provided Latin American nations, but the School of the Americas was an ever-diminishing part of hemispheric military policy during the 1960s and 1970s. These presidents preferred the flexibility afforded by MTTs. Under Jimmy Carter, the United States reconsidered the utility of giving arms and instruction to staunchly anti-

Communist but decidedly undemocratic regimes. Trying to balance stability and security with democracy, Carter ordered an end to counterinsurgency training at the School of the Americas. Increasingly frustrated by the human cost of U.S. counterinsurgency policy, Congress almost succeeded in closing the school in 1979. The rise of popular revolution in Central America at the end of the 1970s, however, led President Carter to hold on to Ft. Gulick. U.S. policy included the sustained participation of the U.S. Army School of the Americas for the first time under Ronald Reagan. During the 1980s, the school provided a significant part of the counterinsurgency and intelligence training that enabled the Salvadoran Army to survive its civil war. Throughout its history, the U.S. Army has never thought highly of the USARCARIB School, the U.S. Army School of the Americas, or its current incarnation, the Western Hemispheric Institute for Security Cooperation, and has consciously relegated it to a position of decidedly minor significance. When religious groups, human rights activists, and former instructors organized in the 1990s to shut down the "School of Assassins," it was the White House that saved the school by redefining its mission – once again – so that it could continue to serve the interests of hemispheric security and development.

Critics of the School of the Americas charge that the sins of the past militate against any future value of U.S. military training programs at Ft. Benning. They argue that the school deliberately taught future dictators and assassins the tools of their trade. Successive presidential administrations since the beginning of World War II have used the training of Latin American armed services to ensure economic and political stability in the Western Hemisphere. The United States correctly identified the Latin American

military as the primary power brokers within their societies and made a point of forging close relations with the actual officers themselves. Routinely, from the 1930s to the present, the U.S. Army has touted the Military Assistance Program because it afforded U.S. armed services the opportunity to impart U.S. military doctrine, anti-Communist ideology, and Western culture to their Latin American students. From Eisenhower and hemispheric defense to Bill Clinton and the open door policy, the U.S. Army harped on the future political importance of Latin American officers in their respective countries' political sphere, and on the salutary effect of U.S. military expertise. The commandants at Ft. Gulick and at Ft. Benning over the decades certainly promoted the instruction offered at the school as serving this purpose.

But it is important to recall the differential impact of the school on Latin America, both chronologically and geographically. The U.S. Army preferred using its missions, MAAGs and MTTs to impart specialized training in host countries. Successive presidents reinforced that policy. Many countries, notably Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay, had their own respected military institutions of higher learning. They disdained assignments to Panama. All the nations of the region preferred training at the more prestigious military schools in the United States. Even in the case of Colombia, whose affiliation with the school goes back to the 1940s, courses at Ft. Gulick and Ft. Benning only served to reinforce U.S. military assistance to that country. The counterinsurgency instruction provided by the U.S. Army School of the Americas represented a small and only occasionally important part of U.S. military policy training.

Perhaps more important, the critics of the school run the risk of patronizing the Latin American military in much the same way that United States policymakers have done.

The Latin American military were not credulous children in this process. They gratefully accepted the materiel the Military Assistance Program provided and asked for more. With rare exception they could foresee no external foe, and both Latin American military leaders and the United States understood that military aid and training would be used for internal security. Moreover, they counted on it. They sought U.S. training, with even greater fervor than American policymakers offered it. And the Latin American military did not randomly select the men who were chosen to benefit from the expertise of the armed services that won World War II. In general, only officers favored within the patronage systems of their country's military received the opportunity to train with the U.S. armed services, preferably in the United States. So it should not be surprising that many Latin American military trained in or by the United States emerged later as key participants in military action and political rule within their own countries. U.S. training certainly helped more than it hurt their standing within their armed services, and the counterinsurgency techniques they learned certainly helped them politically and militarily. Predisposed to distrust civilian politicians, and virulently anti-Communist themselves, the soldiers and officers of the region's armed services took the words of advice from the world's most powerful military to heart and placed themselves in charge in country after country during the 1960s and 1970s. Latin America's military embraced counterinsurgency tactics because they recognized that counterintelligence, psychological warfare, and special operations training would enable them to complete their primary

mission, defense of the fatherland. United States military training did fundamentally alter the perceived mission of the Latin American military, and the people of the region experienced prolonged repression as a result. But the Latin American armed forces did not need the United States to teach them how to oppress their own people. Nevertheless, American policymakers did give them what they believed was a better reason to do so.

The United States knew the long history of intervention by Latin American military men into their domestic politics. The Latin American military were chosen because a succession of United States presidents and their administrations believed that they were the only ones in their societies capable of maintaining order. And both before or after Kennedy, the United States wanted stability and security in Latin America during the cold war so that it could focus on more pressing battlegrounds in Europe, Southeast Asia, and the nuclear arms race. During those years, the United States advanced its case arguing that the Soviet Union represented the forces of totalitarianism, a way of life inimical to free peoples everywhere. With great and understandable pride, Americans celebrated the defeat of the forces of aggression in World War II. After the war, the United States leapt into the international arena convinced that American expertise, drive, and sacrifice could solve any problem and equally convinced it had the God-given responsibility to contain the spread of aggressive and expansionistic Communism. In this fight, American policymakers did not care about the consequences of anti-democratic rule in the underdeveloped world; they worried about the ramifications of Communist subversion. The decision to oppose Communism at any cost has been explained simply as a product of tough choices by tough men in tough times, or the inevitable outgrowth of

modern, industrial capitalism in a never-ending search for markets. But it is more than that. Within the east/west orientation of the cold war, the United States relied on its older, western orientation to treat with the non-white peoples of the world.

Racial paternalism directed the American decision to let anti-Communist dictators hold sway in their countries during the cold war. It may be axiomatic to be sure, but it is worth repeating that the ideas, attitudes, and notions of a people are reflected in the conduct of their foreign relations. The decision to embrace dictatorship in Latin America drew upon the lessons learned in western expansion through the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries and mirrored United States policy toward the rest of the non-Western European world. As a matter of course during the cold war the United States reduced the complex historical contexts of the world's non-white peoples to caricatures predicated on generations-old notions of race and patriarchy. Administration after administration consciously chose to deny to the peoples of the third world the right of national self determination. Over and over again, the United States installed and buttressed repressive regimes that consciously sought better ways to imprison, torture, and murder their own people. And so the United States gave generals and colonels and juntas and other strongmen what they needed so they could do just that. The United States did so repeatedly because successive presidents and the people who served with them did not believe that the people in underdeveloped countries could be trusted not to fall prey to the blandishments of Communist subversion. Like children, they had to be protected from themselves.

True, the level of overt paternalism in U.S. foreign policy has moderated with time. By the end of World War II the rigid racial demarcations in American society had begun to fray, and the continued attacks on racial segregation in the United States ushered in a process of haphazard and intermittent reconciliation. Some have even argued that only in the midst of the cold war did international embarrassment over racial segregation pave the way for integration. In turn, the level of overt paternalism has diminished in the United States; so, too, has it waned in the conduct of United States foreign policy. Increasingly, in the years after the Civil Rights Act of 1964, debate in the United States has confronted the cold war legacy of supporting dictators. But the peoples of the world paid a terrible price for American economic and political security. And it was a price they did not have to pay. In July of 1960, the preeminent architect of American counterinsurgency tactics, Maj. General Edward Lansdale, chastised the Eisenhower administration for installing embargoes on sugar, which "seem to ignore the Cuban people and the responsive feelings for them in Latin America when these Cuban people are hurt by our actions." General Lansdale argued that the United States should have attacked the Communists for betraying the "ideals of the 26 of July Movement," for "in so doing, we would be making use of our own 'political base,' from our Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights, which is still the most powerful method of operating politically in the world." Instead, as General Lansdale pointed out, "the only reason we ever lose ground in the cold war is that we ignore our most potent instrument for waging it." The U.S. Army School of the Americas served a different purpose. While the school has held a decidedly minor place in U.S. military policy toward Latin America, its

existence reflects a defense posture that deliberately and consciously supported a succession of vicious men that the United States generally believed would promote U.S. interests.[222]

[222] Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale (Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Defense) to Waldemar A. Nielsen (Exec. Dir. The President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad), memorandum, 8 July 1960, "Latin America," Sprague Comm., Box 3, FN Latin America #12 (4), 1-2. Eisenhower Presidential Library.

# Bibliography

## LIST OF REFERENCES


Center for Military History, Washington, D.C.

Historical Manuscript Files

Historical Section

Caribbean Defense Command

Country

Department Schools

Headquarters

Panama Canal Department

Training, 1941-1946

War Plans and Defense

Historical Records Collections

8th Special Forces

Conferences

Maneuvers

Meetings

Training

U.S. Army Southern Command

Office of the Staff Secretary

Caribbean Defense Command

Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Abilene, Kansas

- Ann Whitman File
- Christian A. Herter Papers
- Draper Committee
- National Security Council
- Eisenhower Papers, 1953-1961
- Sprague Committee
- White House Central File
- White House Office
  - Staff Secretary, International Trips and Meetings
  - Special Assistant
    - National Security Affairs
    - National Security Agency, 1952-1961

John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, Boston, Massachusetts

- National Security Files
  - National Security Council
  - National Security Action Memoranda
  - Regular Secretary
  - Country
  - Meetings and Memoranda
  - Subject

Presidential Office Files

Country Files

National Security Files

Roger Hilsman Papers

Roswell Gilpatric Papers

Senator John F. Kennedy Papers

Senator Robert Kennedy Papers

Walt W. Rostow Papers

National Archives and Records Administration, II, College Park, Maryland

RG 218 Records of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff

Central Decimal File, 1960

Central Decimal File, 1961

RG 286 Records of the Agency for International Development

Office of Public Safety, Office of the Director, Numerical File, 1956-74

RG 319 Records of the Army Staff

Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1941-1945

Army-Intelligence Project Decimal File, 1946-1948

Classified Correspondence, 1961-1964

Deputy Chief of Staff of Operations

RG 330 Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs)

RG 338 Records of the U.S. Army Commands

Caribbean Defense Command, 1941-1948

U.S. Army, Caribbean, 1947-1964

RG 407 Records of the Adjutant General's Office

1917-, Classified Central General Administrative Files, 1955-1962

1955-1956 Cases

1961 Cases

RG 498 U.S. Army Caribbean School [School of the Americas]

RG 59 General Records of the Department of State

Bureau of Inter-American Affairs

Records of the Special Assistant on Communism, 1958-1962

Office of Central American and Panamanian Affairs

Subject and Country Files, 1955-1963

Office of Regional Political Affairs

Country and Subject Files, 1950-1963

Central Decimal Files, 1955-1959

Central Decimal File, 1960-1963

Central Foreign Policy File, 1964-1966

Central Foreign Policy Files, 1967-1969

Executive Secretariat

Records of the Special Group (Counter Insurgency), 1962-1966

Office of the Deputy Director of Program and Planning (Special Assistant for Mutual Security Coordination), Office Files of John O. Bell, 1957-1961

Records of the Policy Planning Staff, 1957-1961

Records of State-JCS Meetings, 1959-1963

Task Force on Latin America

Subject and Country Files, 1961

Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (Formerly the U.S. Army School of the Americas), John B. Amos Library, Ridgeway Hall, Ft. Benning, Georgia

Russell Ramsay Papers

USARCARIB School

Catalogs, 1952-1963

U.S. Army School of the Americas

Catalogs, 1964-2001

National Security Archive, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

DOD Manuals, Survey of Objectionable and Questionable Passages

El Salvador: War, Peace, and Human Rights, 1980-1994

USSOUTHCOM CI Training

**SECONDARY WORKS**


Abel, Elie. The Missile Crisis. Philadelphia 1966.

Abrahamsson, Begnt. Military Professionalization and Political Power. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1972.

Ahmad, Eqbal. "The Roots of Misconceptions." In No More Vietnams? The War and the Future of American Foreign Policy, Edited by Richard M. Pfeffer. New York: Harper/Colophon, 1968.

Alba, Victor. El militarismo. Mexico: UNAM, 1960.

Alexander, Robert C. Labor Relations in Argentina, Brazil and Chile. Foreword by John Dunlop. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Allison, Graham T. Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. Boston: Brown & Little, 1971.

Ambrose, Stephen. The Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy since 1938. 6th ed. New York: Penguin, 1991.

Ashworth, P. D. Symbolic Interaction and Consciousness. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1979.

Ausland, John C. Kennedy, Khrushchev, and the Berlin-Cuba Crisis, 1961-1964. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1996.

Bales, Robert F. "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead." American Journal of Sociology 72 (1966): 535-48.

Baron, Ava. "Gender and Labor History: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future." In Work Gendered: Toward a New History of American Labor, edited by Ava Baron. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Bastias, María Verónica. El salario del miedo: narcotráfico en América latina. Buenos Aires: SERPAJ-AL, 1993.

Bauer, Jack K. The Mexican War, 1846-1848. Introduction by Robert W. Johnson. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.

Bells, John Patrick. Crisis in Costa Rica: Revolution in 1948. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. The Latin American Policy of the United States. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1943.

------. John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Diplomacy. New York: Knopf, 1949.

Benjamin, Jules R. The United States and the Origins of the Cuban Revolution: An Empire of Liberty in an Age of National Liberation. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Beschloss, Michael. The Crisis Years: Kennedy and Khrushchev, 1960-1963. New York: HarperCollins, 1991.

Blanksten, George. "The Politics of Latin America." In The Politics of Developing Areas, edited by Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960, 455-531.

Blasier, Cole. Hovering Giant: U.S. Responses to Revolutionary Change in Latin America. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1976.
Blumer, Herbert. Symbolic Interaction: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1969.
------. "Comment on Lewis's 'The Classic American Pragmatists As Forerunners to Symbolic Interactionism'." The Sociological Quarterly 18 no. 2 (Spr. 1977): 285-9.
Boot, Max. The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
Booth, John A. The End and the Beginning: The Nicaraguan Revolution. Boulder: Westview, 1982.
Boyle, Peter G. American-Soviet Relations: From the Russin Revolution to the Fall of Communism. London: Routledge, 1993.
Brands, H. W. The Limits of Globalism: Lyndon Johnson and the Limits of American Power. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
Brinkley, Alan. The End of Reform: New Deal Liberalism in Recession and War. New York: Knopf, 1995.
Brooks Higgenbotham, Evelyn. "African-American Women's History and the Meta Language of Race." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 17 no. 1 (1992): 251-274.
Brown, Jonathan. Oil and Revolution in Mexico. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
Burke, Peter. History and Social Theory. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
Burns, E. Bradford. The Poverty of Progress: Latin America in the Nineteenth Century. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
Camp, Roderick. Generals in the Palacio: The Military in Modern Mexico. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
Cardoso, Fernando Henrique, and Enzo Falletto. Dependency and Development. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979. [1969].
------. Empresário industrial e desenvolvimento econômico no Brasil. 2d ed. São Paulo: Difusão Européia do Livro, 1972.
------. "The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States." Latin American Research Review 12 (1977): 7-24.
Centeno, Miguel Angel. Democracy within Reason: Technocratic Revolution in Mexico. University Park: Penn State University Press, 1994.
Chandler, Alfred D. The Visible Hand: The Management Revolution in American Business. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1977.
Child, John. Unequal Alliance: The Inter-American Military System, 1938-1978. Boulder: Westview, 1980.
Clark, Jr., Paul Coe. The United States and Somoza, 1933-1956: A Revisionist Look. New York: Praeger, 1992.
Coatsworth, John H. Central America and the United States: The Clients and the Colossus. New York: Twayne, 1994.

Collier, David. The New Authoritarianism in Latin America. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.
Collin, Richard H. Theodore Roosevelt's Caribbean: The Panama Canal, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Latin American Context. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.
Committee of Santa Fe. "A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties," written by Francis Bouchey, Roger Fontaine, David Jordan, Gordon Sumner, and Lewis Tambs, 1980.
Connell-Smith, Gordon. The Inter-American System. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
Conniff, Michael L. Panama and the United States: The Forced Alliance. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992.
Dahl, Robert Alan. Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
Danner, Mark. The Massacre at El Mozote. New York: Vintage, 1994. [1993].
Davis, Nathaniel. The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.
Davis, Sonny B. Brotherhood of Arms: Brazil-United States Military Relations, 1945-1977. Niwot, CO: University Press of Colorado, 1996.
DeConde, Alexander. Herbert Hoover's Latin American Policy. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951.
------. Ethnicity, Race, and American Foreign Policy: A History. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992.
Díaz Cardona, Francía Elena. Fuerzas armadas, militarismo y constitución nacional en América latina. Mexico: UNAM, 1988.
Divine, Robert A. Since 1945: Politics and Diplomacy in Recent American History. 3d ed. New York: Knopf, 1985.
Divine, Robert A., ed. The Cuban Missile Crisis. 2d ed. New York: M. Weiner, 1988.
Dominguez, Jorge I. Cuba: Order and Revolution. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1978.
Dosal, Paul. Doing Business with Dictators: A Political History of United Fruit in Guatemala, 1899-1944. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1993.
Drake, Paul W. The Money Doctor in the Andes: The Kemmerer Missions, 1923-1933. Durham: Duke University Press, 1989.
Draper, Theodore. The Dominican Revolt: A Case Study in American Policy. New York: Commentary Report, 1968.
Drinnon, Richard. Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian Hating and Empire Building. New York: Shoken, 1990. [1980].
Drukman, Mason. Wayne Morse: A Political Biography. Portland: Oregon Historical Society Press, 1997.
Dunkerley, James. Unity and Struggle: Trade Unions in Latin America. London: Latin American Bureau, 1980.
------. The Long War: Dictatorship and Revolution in El Salvador. London: Junction, 1982.

------. Rebellion in the Veins: Political Struggle in Bolivia, 1952-1882. London: Verso, 1984.
------. Power in the Isthmus: A Political History of Modern Central America. London: Verso, 1988.
------. Political Transition and Economic Stabilization in Bolivia, 1982-89. London: Institute for Latin American Studies, 1990.
Duvall, Raymond D. "Dependence and Dependencia Theory: Notes toward Precision of Concept and Argument." International Organization 32 no.1 (Win. 1978): 51-78.
Eagleton, Terry. Literary Theory: An Introduction. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
Escalante, Fabián. The Secret War: CIA Covert Operations Against Cuba, 1959-62. Translated by Maxine Shaw. Edited by Mirta Muñiz. Melbourne: Ocean Press, 1995.
Escobar, Arturo. Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
Espinoza, Manuel. Inter-American Beginnings of U.S. Cultural Diplomacy. Washington: U.S. State Department, 1976.
Estep, Raymond. U.S. Military Aid to Latin America. Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University, 1966.
Etchison, Don L. The United States and Militarism in Central America. New York: Praeger, 1975.
Etienne, Teodoro F. Fuerzas armadas de América latina: nuevo rol: problemática de la droga. Bogotá: Tercer Mundo, 1997.
Evans, Peter. Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multi-National State and Local Capital in Brazil. Foreword by Florestan Fernandes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.
Faoro, Raymundo. Os donos do poder: formaçâo do patronato politico brasileiro. 2 vols. São Paulo: Editora Globo, 1975. [1959].
Feit, Edward. The Armed Bureaucrats: Military Administration Regimes and Political Development. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
Ferrer, Ada. "Social Aspects of Cuban Nationalism: Race, Slavery, and the Guerra Chiquita, 1879-1880." Cuban Studies 21 (1990): 37-56.
Fields, Barbara Jeanne. "Slavery, Race, and Ideology in the United States of America." The New Left Review no. 181 (May/June 1990): 95-118.
Foner, Philip S. A History of Cuba and Its Relations with the United States. 2 vols. New York: International, 1962.
------. Spanish-Cuban-American War and the Birth of American Imperialism, 1895-1898. 2 vols. New York: Monthly Review, 1972.
Ford, Henry, with Fay Leone Faurote. My Philosophy of Industry. New York: Coward-McCann, 1929.
Ford, Henry, with Samuel Crowther. Today and Tomorrow. New York: Doubleday, Page, & Co., 1926.

Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1977. [1975].
Frank, André Gunder. "The Development of Underdevelopment." Monthly Review (Sept. 1966): 17-31.
Freud, Sigmund. The Ego and the Id. Authorized Translation by Joan Riviere. London: Hogarth, 1947.
Furtado, Celso. The Economic Growth of Brazil. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.
------. The Economic Development of Latin America: Historical Background and Contemporary Problems. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
Gaddis, John Lewis. The United States and the Origins of the Cold War. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.
------. Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
Gardner, Lloyd C. Economic Aspects of New Deal Diplomacy. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.
------. Architects of Illusion: Men and Ideas in American Foreign Policy, 1941-1949. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970.
Garthoff, Raymond L. Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan. Washington: Brookings Institute, 1985.
Gellman, Irwin F. Good Neighbor Diplomacy: United States Policies in Latin America, 1933-1945. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
General Accounting Office. School of the Americas: U.S. Military Training for Latin American Countries. http://purl.access.gpo.gov/gpo/lps30003.
Germani, Gino. Latin America: The Dynamics of Social Change. London: Allison & Burby, 1972.
Gerstle, Gary. American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
Gettleman, Marvin E. et al., eds. El Salvador in the New Cold War. New York: Grove Press, 1981.
Giglio, John. The Presidency of John F. Kennedy. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1991.
Gil, Frederico. Latin American-United States Relations. San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1971.
Gilderhaus, Mark T. The Second Century: U.S.-Latin American Relations since 1889. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2000.
Gilmore, Robert L. Caudillism and Militarism in Venezuela. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1964.
Gimbel, John. Origins of the Marshall Plan. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976.
Glejeises, Peiro. Shattered Hope: The Guatemalan Revolution and the United States, 1944-1954. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
Gootenberg, Paul, ed. Cocaine: Global Histories. London: Routledge, 1999.
Graebner, Norman. Cold War Diplomacy, 1945-1960. New York: Anvil, 1962.

Gramsci, Antonio. Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci. Edited and Translated by Quinten Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International, 1971.
Graves, Ernest, and Steven Hildreth. U.S. Security Assistance: The Political Process. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1985.
Green, David. The Containment of Latin America: A History of the Myths and Realities of the Good Neighbor Policy. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.
Griffith, Robert. "Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Corporate Commonwealth." American Historical Review 87 no. 1 (Feb. 1992): 87-122.
Griswold del Castillo, Richard. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: A Legacy of Conflict. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990.
Guevara, Ché. Guerrilla Warfare. Edited by Brian Loveman and Thomas M. Davies, Jr. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.
Guha, Ranjit, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, eds. Selected Subaltern Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
Guillén, Mauro F. Models of Management: Work, Authority, and Organization in a Comparative Perspective. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
Gullickson, Gay. "Commentary: New Labor History from the Perspective of a Women's Historian." In Rethinking Labor History, edited by Lenard R. Berlanstein. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
Haber, Stephen H. Industry and Underdevelopment: The Industrialization of Mexico, 1890-1940. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989.
Haglund, David F. Latin America and the Transformation of U.S. Strategic Thought, 1936-1940. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.
Hall, John R. "The Patrimonial Dynamic in Colonial Brazil." In Brazil and the World System, edited by Richard Graham. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991.
Hall, Linda B. Oil, Banks, and Politics: The United States and Postrevolutionary Mexico. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995.
Harvey, David. The Condition of Post Modernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
Healy, David. Driven to Hegemony: The United States in the Caribbean, 1889-1917. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.
Heitala, Thomas R. Manifest Design: Anxious Aggrandizement in Late Jacksonian America. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.
Helg, Aline. Our Rightful Share: The Afro-Cuban Struggle for Equality, 1886-1912. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
Hernández, José M. Cuba and the United States: Intervention and Militarism, 1868-1933. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993.
Higgins, Trumbull. The Perfect Failure: Kennedy, Eisenhower, and the CIA at the Bay of Pigs. New York: Norton, 1989.
Hincle, Warren, and William W. Turner. The Fish Is Red: The Story of the Secret War Against Castro. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

Hirschman, Albert O. The Strategy for Economic Development. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.
Hobsbawm, E. J. Primitive Rebels. New York: Norton, 1965. [1959].
------. Bandits. New York: Dell, 1971. [1969].
Hoff, Joan. Nixon Reconsidered. New York: Basic Books, 1994.
Hoffman, Elizabeth Cobbs, All You Need Is Love: The Peace Corps and the Spirit of the 1960s. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
Hogan, Michael J. The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Horsman, Reginald. Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
Hunt, Michael H. Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.
Huntington, Samuel P. The Soldier and State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations. New York: Vantage, 1964.
------. "Will More Countries Become Democratic?" Political Science Quarterly 99 (Sum. 1984): 193-218.
Imerman, Vicky. SOA Alumni and Human Rights Abuse. Gilbert, IA: Info SOA, [1995].
Immerman, Richard H. The CIA in Guatemala: The Foreign Policy of Intervention. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982.
Info SOA. La lagartija=Little lizard: Newsletter of Info SOA. Gilbert, IA: Info SOA, 1995.
James, Daniel. Resistance and Integration: Peronism and the Argentine Working Class, 1946-1976. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
Johnson, Cecil. Communist China and Latin America, 1959-1967. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
Johnson, John J. The Military and Society in Latin America. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.
------. Latin America in Caricature. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980.
Joseph, Gilbert M., Catherine C. Legrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore, eds. Close Encounters with Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
Kakar, Sudhir. Frederick Taylor: A Study in Personality. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1970.
Karl, Terry Lynn. "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America." Comparative Politics 23 no. 1 (Oct. 1990): 1-21.
Katz, Frederich. The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, the United States, and the Mexican Revolution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
Kaufman, Burton I. Trade and Aid: Eisenhower's Foreign Economic Policy, 1953-1961. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.
Kay, Cristóbal. Latin American Theories of Development and Underdevelopment. London: Routledge, 1989.
Kennedy, Robert F. Thirteen Days. New York: Norton, 1971.

Kennedy-Pipe, Caroline. Stalin's Cold War: Soviet Strategies in Europe, 1943 to 1956. New York: Manchester University Press, 1995.
Kenny, Kevin. Making the Molly McGuires. New York: Oxford, 1998.
Kenworthy, Eldon. America/Américas: Myth in the Making of U.S. Policy toward Latin America. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.
Kestler-Harris, Alice. "A New Agenda for American Labor History: A Gendered Analysis and the Question of Class." In Perspectives on American Labor History: The Problems of Synthesis, edited by J. Carroll Moody and Alice Kestler-Harris. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
Kirkpatrick, Jeane J. "Dictatorships and Double Standards." Commentary 68 no. 3 (Nov. 1979): 34-45.
------. Dictatorships and Double Standards: Rationalism and Reason in Politics. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982.
Kjonnerod, J. Erik, ed. Evolving U.S. Strategy for Latin America and the Caribbean. Washington: National Defense University Press, 1992.
Klare, Michael T., and Cynthia Arnson. Supplying Repression: U.S. Support of Authoritarian Regimes Abroad. Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1981.
Knippers Black, Jan. Sentinels of Empire: The United States and Latin American Militarism. Westport: Greenwood, 1986.
Krenn, Michael L., and Paul Finkleman, eds. Race and U.S. Foreign Policy: From Colonial Times to the Age of Jackson. New York: Taylor & Francis, 1998.
Kunz, Diane B. Butter and Guns: America's Cold War Economic Diplomacy. New York: The Free Press, 1997.
Kunz, Diane B., ed. The Diplomacy of the Crucial Decade: American Foreign Relations during the 1960s. New York: Colombia University Press, 1994.
La Capra, Dominic. History and Criticism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.
LaFeber, Walter. The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963.
------. The Panama Canal: The Crisis in Historical Perspective. Updated ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
------. Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America. 2d Rev. ed. New York: Norton, 1992.
------. America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1992. 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.
Langley, Lester. The Banana Wars: United States Intervention in the Caribbean, 1898-1934. Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1983.
------. The United States and Latin America in the Twentieth Century. 4th ed. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989.
Latham, Michael E. Modernization As Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era. Chapel Hill: Duke University Press, 2000.
Lauderback, David. The War Scare of March 1948: Domestic Considerations and Popular Perceptions of the Soviet Threat. Master's Report, University of Texas at Austin, 1996.

Le Riverend, Julio. La república: dependencia y revolución. 4th ed. rev. Havana: Instituto Cubano Libro, 1975.
Leacock, Ruth. Requiem for Revolution: The United States and Brazil, 1961-1969. London: Kent State University Press, 1990.
Lears, T. Jackson. "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities." American Historical Review 90 no. 3 (June 1985): 567-93.
------. Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising. New York: Basic Books, 1994.
Leffler, Melvyn P. A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
LeoGrande, William. "Our Own Backyard": The United States in Central America, 1977-1992. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
Leonard, Thomas M. Central America and the United States: The Search for Stability. Athens: University Press of Georgia, 1991.
Lerner, Daniel. The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East. New York: Free Press, 1958.
Levinson Jerome I., and Juan de Onis. The Alliance that Lost Its Way: A Critical Report on the Alliance for Progress. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1970.
Lewis, W. Arthur. "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour." In Economics of Underdevelopment, edited by Aman Narin Agarvualu and S. P. Singh. Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1958.
Lieuwen, Edwin. Arms and Politics in Latin America. Rev. ed. New York: Praeger, 1961.
------. Generals vs. Presidents: Neo-Militarism in Latin America. New York: Praeger, 1964.
------. U.S. Policy in Latin America: A Short History. New York: Praeger, 1965.
Linowitz, Sol. The Americas in a Changing World. New York: Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations, 1975.
------. The U.S. and Latin America: The Next Steps. New York: Quadrangle, 1976.
Litwack, Robert S. Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
Lobato, Mirta Zaída. El "taylorismo" en la gran industria exportadora Argentina, 1907-1945. Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América latina, 1988.
Loveman, Brian. For La Patria: Politics and the Armed Forces in Latin America. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1999.
Loveman, Brian, and Thomas M. Davies, Jr., eds. The Politics of Antipolitics: The Military in Latin America. 2d Rev. ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.
Lowenthal, Abraham F. The Dominican Intervention. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. [1972].
------. Partners in Conflict: The United States and Latin America. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
Macaulay, Neil. The Sandino Affair. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1967.

Madariaga, Salvador de. Latin America between the Eagle and the Bear. New York: Praeger, 1962.
Maier, Charles S. Recasting Bourgeois Europe: Stabilization in France, Germany and Italy in the Decade After World War I. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.
Mallon, Florencia. "The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History." American Historical Review 99 no. 5 (Dec. 1994): 1491-1515.
Marchetti, Victor, and John D. Marks. The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence. London: Jonathan Cope, 1971.
May, Ernest R. The Making of the Monroe Doctrine. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
May, Robert E. The Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire, 1854-1861. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973.
McCann, Jr., Frank D. The Brazilian-American Alliance, 1937-1945. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.
McClintock, Michael. The American Connection. London: Zed, 1985.
------. Strategies of Statecraft: U.S. Guerrilla Warfare, Counter-Insurgency, and Counterterrorism, 1940-1990. New York: Pantheon, 1992.
McCormick, Thomas J. The China Market: America's Quest for Informal Empire. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1967.
McCullogh, David. The Path Between the Seas. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1977.
Mead, George Herbert. Mind, Self, Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist. Edited and Introduction by Charles W. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
Mecham, J. Lloyd. The United States and Inter-American Security. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961.
Merk, Frederick. Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation. New York: Vintage, 1963.
Meyer, III, Stephen. The Five Dollar Day: Labor Management and Social Control in the Ford Motor Company, 1908-1921. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1981.
Miller, Delia, and Roland Seeman, with Cynthia Arnson. Background Information on Guatemala, the Armed Forces and U.S. Military Assistance. Washington: Institute for Policy Studies, 1981.
Millikin, Max F. and Walt W. Rostow, A Proposal: Key to an Effective Foreign Policy. New York: Harper, 1957.
Morales, Edmundo. Cocaine: White Gold Rush in Peru. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 1989.
Morgan, H. Wayne. America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion. New York: Wiley, 1965.
Morley, Morris H. Imperial State and Revolution: The United States and Cuba, 1952-1986. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Munro, Dana. Intervention and Dollar Diplomacy in the Caribbean. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
Myrdal, Gunnar. Development and Underdevelopment. Cairo: National Bank of Egypt, 1956.
Nadworny, Milton J. Scientific Management and the Unions, 1900-1932: A Historical Analysis. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.
Nelson-Palmeyer, Jack. School of Assassins. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997.
Nieto, Clara. Masters of War: Latin America and U.S. Aggression from the Cuban Revolution through the Clinton Years. New York: Seven Stories, 2003.
Nolan, Mary. "Housework Made Easy: The Taylorized Housewife in Weimar, Germany's Rationalized Economy." Feminist Studies 16 no. 3 (Fall 1990): 549-77.
Nolff, Max. Salvador Allende: el político, el estadista. Santiago: Documentas, 1993.
North, Liisa. Bitter Grounds: Roots of Revolt in El Salvador. 2d ed. Westport: Lawrence Hill, 1989.
Novais, Fernando A. "Brazil in the Old Colonial System." Translated by Richard Graham and Hank Phillips. In Brazil and the World System, edited by Richard Graham. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991.
Nunn, Frederick. "An Overview of the European Military Missions to Latin America," Military Affairs 39 (Feb. 1975): 1-7.
------. The Time of the Generals: Latin American Professional Militarism in World Perspective. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.
O'Brien, Thomas F. The Century of U.S. Capitalism in Latin America. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999.
Ocampo, Antonio. "New Economic Thinking in Latin America." Journal of Latin American Studies 22 no. 1 (Feb. 1990): 169-181.
O'Donnell, Guillermo, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, eds. Transition from Authoritarian Rule: Latin America. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
O'Donnell, Guillermo, and Philippe Schmitter. Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies. Foreword by Abraham F. Lowenthal. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986
Offner, John L. An Unwanted War: The Diplomacy of the United States and Spain Over Cuba. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
Opatrny, Josef. United States Expansionism and Cuban Annexationism in the 1850s. Prague: Charles University, 1990.
Osgood, Kenneth. "Form before Substance: Eisenhower's Commitment to Psychological Warfare and Negotiations with the Enemy." Diplomatic History 24 no. 3 (Sum. 2000): 405-33.
Pach, Jr., Chester J., and Elmo Richardson. The Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower. Rev. ed. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1991.
Pach, Jr., Chester J. Arming the Free World: The Origins of the United States Military Assistance Program. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Palma, Gabriel. "Dependency: A Formal Theory of Underdevelopment or a Methodology for the Analysis of Concrete Situations of Underdevelopment?" World Development 6 no. 7/8 (July/Aug. 1978): 881-924.

Palmer, Bryan D. Descent into Discourse: the Reification of Language and the Writing of Social History. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

Paquette, Robert L. Sugar Is Made of Blood: The Conspiracy of La Escalera and the Conflict between Empires Over Slavery in Cuba. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1988.

Pastor, Robert. Condemned to Repetition: The United States and Nicaragua. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Paterson, Thomas G. On Every Front: The Making of the Cold War. New York: Norton, 1979.

------. Contesting Castro: The United States and the Triumph of the Cuban Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Pérez, Jr., Louis A. "Vagrants, Beggars, and Bandits: Social Origins of Cuban Separatism, 1878-1895." American Historical Review 90 no. 5 (Dec. 1985): 1092-1121.

------. Cuba: Between Reform and Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

------. Lords of the Mountain: Social Banditry and Peasant Protest in Cuba, 1878-1918. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989.

------. Cuba and the United States: Ties of Singular Intimacy, 1952-1986. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990.

Pérez-Stable, Marifeli. The Cuban Revolution: Origins, Course, and Legacy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Perkins, Bradford. Castlereagh and Adams. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964.

Perkins, Dexter. The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1937.

Petersen, Elmore, et al., Business Organization and Management. 5th ed. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Erwin, 1962.

Pike, Frederick B. The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992.

Pion-Berlin, David. "The Defiant State: Chile in the Post-Coup Era." In Armies and Politics in Latin America, edited by Abraham F. Lowenthal and J. Samuel Fitch. New York: Holes & Meier, 1986.

Pletcher, David M. The Awkward Years: American Foreign Policy under Garfield and Arthur. Colombia: University of Missouri Press, 1962.

------. The Diplomacy of Annexation: Texas, Oregon, and the Mexican War. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973.

------. The Diplomacy of Trade and Investment: American Investment in the Hemisphere, 1865-1900. Colombia: University Press, 1998.

Plummer, Brenda Gayle. Haiti and the Great Power, 1902-1915. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992.
Pope, Ronald R., ed. Soviet Views on the Cuban Missile Crisis: Myth and Reality in Foreign Policy Analysis. Washington: University Press of America, 1982.
Poyo, Gerald E. "With All and for the Good of All": The Emergence of Popular Nationalism in the Cuban Communities of the United States, 1848-1898. Durham: Duke University Press, 1989.
Prebisch, Raúl. Towards a Dynamic Development Policy for Latin America. New York: United Nations, Economic Commission for Latin America, 1950.
Przeworski, Adam. "Some Problems in the Study of the Transition to Democracy." In Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives, edited by Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead. Foreword by Abraham F. Lowenthal. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
Pye, Lucien. Politics, Personality, and Nation Building: Burma's Search for Identity. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.
Quirk, Robert E. An Affair of Honor: Woodrow Wilson and the Occupation of Veracruz. New York: Norton, 1962.
------. Fidel Castro. New York: Norton, 1993.
Rabe, Stephen. Eisenhower and Latin America: The Foreign Policy of Anti-Communism. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
------. The Most Dangerous Area in the World: John F. Kennedy Confronts Communist Revolution in Latin America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
Ramsey, Russell W., ed. Guardians of the Other Americas: Essays on the Military Forces of Latin America. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1997.
Remmer, Karen. The Chilean Military under Authoritarian Rule. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987.
------. Military Rule in Latin America. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
Report of the President's National Bipartisan Commission on Central America. Foreword by Henry Kissinger. New York: MacMillan, 1984.
Rockefeller, Nelson A. The Rockefeller Report on the Americas: The Official Report of a United States Presidential Mission for the Western Hemisphere. Introduction by Tad Szulc. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969.
Roediger, David. The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class. London: Verso, 1991.
Rogers, William D. The Twilight Struggle: The Alliance for Progress and the Politics of Development in Latin America. New York: Random House, 1967.
Roseberry, William. "Hegemony and the Language of Contention." In Everyday Forms of State Formation, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent. Durham: Duke University Press, 1994.
Rostow, Walt W. The Process of Economic Growth. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

------. The Prospects for Communist China. Cambridge: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1954.
------. An American Policy in Asia. New York: Wiley, 1955.
------. The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
------. "Guerrilla Warfare in Underdeveloped Areas." Marine Corps Gazette 46 no. 1 (Jan. 1962): 46-49.
Ruíz, Ramón Eduardo. Cuba: The Making of a Revolution. New York: Norton, 1968.
Rustow, Dankwart. "Transitions to Democracy: Toward A Dynamic Model." Comparative Politics 2 (Apr. 1970): 337-363.
Santos, Theotonio dos. "The Structure of Dependence." American Economic Review 60 no. 2 (1970): 231-6.
Sayer, Derek. "Everyday Forms of State Formation: Some Dissident Remarks on 'Hegemony'." In Everyday Forms of State Formation, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent. Durham: Duke University Press, 1994.
Schachter, Hindy Lauer. Frederick Taylor and the Public Administration Community: A Reevaluation. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.
Schlesinger, Stephen, and Stephen Kinzer. Bitter Fruit: The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala. New York: Anchor, 1983. [1982].
Schmidt, Hans. The United States Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934. Foreword by Stephen Solarz. New Brunzwick: Rutgers University Press, 1995. [1971].
Schmitz, David F. Thank God They're on Our Side: The United States and Right-Wing Dictatorships, 1921-1965. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
Schneider, Ronald. Communism in Guatemala. New York: Octagon, 1979.
"School of Americas, School of Assassins." New York: Maryknoll World Productions, 1994, 20 min., video.
Schoonover, Thomas. The United States in Central America, 1860-1911: Episodes of Imperialism and Imperial Rivalry in the World System. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
Schoultz, Lars. Human Rights and United States Policy toward Latin America. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
------. Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy toward Latin America. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
------. National Security and United States Policy toward Latin America. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
Schroeder, Pat. U.S. Defense: What Can We Afford? Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1980.
Schwartz, Rosalie. Lawless Liberators: Political Banditry and Cuban Independence. Durham: Duke University Press, 1989.
Scott, Joan Wallach. Gender and the Politics of History. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
Scott, Rebecca J. Slave Emanicipation in Cuba: The Transition to Free Labor, 1860-1899. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Scranton, Margaret. The Noriega Years. Boulder: Westbrook, 1991.
Semo, Enrique. The History of Capitalism in Mexico: Its Origins, 1521-1763. Translated by Lidia Lozano. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993.
Sereseres, Caesar D. "Military Development and the United States Military Assistance Program for Latin America: The Case of Guatemala, 1961-1969." 263 leaves, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California Riverside, 1971. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1972. OCLC: 13906998, Microfilm.
Shirley, Sheryl Lynn. "The Impact of United States Security Assistance on Democracy in Latin America: The Case of Guatemala during the 1960s." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas, 1997. AAT 9803024 http://80-wwwlib.umi.com.content.lib.utexas.edu:2048/cr/utexas/fullcit?p9803024.
Shott, Susan. "Society, Self, Mind and Moral Philosophy: The Scottish Moralists as Precursors to Symbolic Interactionism." Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences 12 (1976): 39-46.
Silva, Patricio. "Technocrats and Politics in Chile: From the Chicago Boys to the CIEPLAN Monks." Journal of Latin American Studies 23 no. 2 (May 1991): 385-410.
Silvert, Kalman, and Leonard Reismann. Education, Class, and Nation: The Experiences of Chile and Venezuela. New York: Elsevier, 1976.
Silvert, Kalman. Essays in Understanding Latin America. Philadelphia: ISHI, 1977.
Skidmore, Thomas. Politics in Brazil, 1930-1964. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
Slater, Jerome. Intervention and Negotiation: The United States and the Dominican Revolution. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
Smith, Arthur Robert. The Tiger in the Senate: The Biography of Wayne Morse. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1962.
Smith, Gaddis. The Last Years of the Monroe Doctrine. New York: Hill & Wang, 1994.
Smith, Peter H. Talons of the Eagle: Dynamics of U.S. Latin American Relations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
Smith, Wayne S. The Closest of Enemies: A Personal and Diplomatic Account of U.S.-Cuban Relations since 1957. New York: Norton, 1987.
Stallings, Barbara. Banker to the World: U.S. Portfolio Investment in Latin America 1900-1986. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
Stein, Stanley J., and Barbara H. Stein. The Colonial Heritage of Latin America: Essays on Economic Dependence in Perspective. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
Stepan, Alfred. Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
Stephenson, Anders. Manifest Destiny: American Expansionism and the Empire of Right. New York: Hill & Wang, 1995.
Susman, Warren I. Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century. New York: Pantheon.
Szulc, Tad. Dominican Diary. New York: Praeger, 1965.

Taylor, Frederick Winslow. Shop Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1911.
------. The Principles of Scientific Management. New York: Norton, 1967. [1911].
Taylor, Maxwell. The Uncertain Trumpet. New York: Harper, 1960.
Thomas, Hugh. The Cuban Revolution. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
Thomas, William I. The Unadjusted Girl. Boston: Little & Brown, 1931.
Thompson, E. P. The Making of the English Working Class. New York: Viking, 1963.
Troyer, William Lewis. "Mead's Social and Functional Theory of Mind." American Sociological Review 11 (Apr. 1946): 198-202.
Turner, Frederick Jackson. Frontier and Section: Selected Essays of Frederick Jackson Turner. Introduction by Ray Allen Billington. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
U.S. Department of State. Special Report No. 80. 23 Feb. 1981. Communist Interference in El Salvador. Washington: GPO, 1981.
------. Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960. Vol. V. The American Republics. Washington: GPO, 1991.
------. Foreign Relations in the United States, 1961-1963. Vol. XII. The American Republics. Washington: GPO, 1996.
U.S. House. Committee on International Relations. International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act, 1976. 94th Cong. 1st sess. Washington: GPO, 1976.
U.S. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Sub-Committee on the American Republics. South America: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela. Wayne Morse Study Mission to South America. 86th Cong. 2d sess. 20 Feb. 1960. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.
------. Committee on Foreign Relations. Delusion and Reality: The Future of U.S.-Cuba: Report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Frank Church on His Trip to Cuba, Aug. 8-11, 1977. 95th Cong. 1st sess. Washington: GPO, 1977.
------. Committee on Foreign Relations. Inter-American Affairs. U.S. Military Policies in Latin America, 1969. 87th Cong. 1ST sess. Washington: GPO, 1969.
USARSA. "Armies Can Be Builders." Army Digest 20 no. 2 (Feb. 1965): 16-19.
------. "U.S. Army School of the Americas." Military Review 40 no. 4 (Apr. 1970): 86-93.
Valenzuela, Arturo. The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Chile. Edited by Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
Van Atta, Don. "Why Is There No Taylorism in the Soviet Union?" Comparative Politics 18 no. 3 (Apr. 1986): 327-37.
Walker III, William O., ed. Drugs in the Western Hemisphere: An Odyssey of Cultures in Conflict. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1996.
Walter, Knut. The Regime of Anastasio Somoza, 1936-1956. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.
Webb, Gary. Dark Alliance: The CIA, the Contras, and the Crack Cocaine Explosion. New York: Seven Stories, 1999. [1998].
Weber, Max. The Interpretation of Social Reality. Edited and introduction by J. E. T. Eldridge. London: Joseph, 1970.

Weinstein, Barbara. For Social Peace in Brazil: Industrialists and the Remaking of the Working Class in São Paulo, 1920-1964. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
Weis, Michael W. Cold Warriors and Coups d'etat: Brazilian-American Relations, 1945-1964. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1993.
Welch, John H. "The New Face of Latin America: Financial Flows, Markets and Institutions in the 1990s." Journal of Latin American Studies 25 no. 1 (Feb. 1993): 1-24.
Welch, Richard. Response to Revolution: The United States and the Cuban Revolution. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.
Weston, Rubin Francis. Racism in U.S. Imperialism: The Influence of Racial Assumptions on American Foreign Policy, 1893-1946. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1972.
White, Mark J. The Cuban Missile Crisis. London: MacMillan, 1996.
Wickham-Crowley, Timothy P. Guerrillas & Revolution in Latin America: A Comparison of Insurgents and Regimes since 1956. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
Wiegert, Andre J. Social Psychology: A Sociological Approach through Interpretive Understanding. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.
Williams, William. The Tragedy of American Diplomacy. Cleveland: World Publication, 1959.
Winant, Howard. Racial Conditions: Politics, Theory, Comparisons. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
Winn, Peter. "A Worker's Nightmare: Taylorism and the 1962 Yarur Strike in Chile." Radical History Review 58 (Win. 1994): 4-34.
Wood, Bryce. The Making of the Good Neighbor Policy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
Wrege, Charles D., and Ronald F. Greenwood. Frederick W. Taylor, The Father of Scientific Management: Myth and Reality. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin, 1991.
Wyden, Peter. Bay of Pigs: The Untold Story. New York: Touchstone, 1979.
Yergin, Daniel. Shattered Peace: The Origins of the Cold War. New York: Penguin, 1990. [1979].

# Vita

David Marcus Lauderback was born in Reno, Nevada on May 29, 1963, the son of Delaney Eckles Lauderback and Stephanie Anne Riegel. He was raised in San Francisco, California and completed work at Westmoor High School in 1981. He thereupon entered San Diego State University and received a Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts and Sciences, with honors, in 1986. During the following years he was employed as a research associate at the Institute for Scientific Analysis in San Francisco, California. He joined Laura Di Pasquale in marriage in 1992. He entered The Graduate School at the University of Texas at Austin in 1994. The University of Texas at Austin awarded David Marcus Lauderback the Masters of Arts in Liberal Arts and Sciences in May 1996.

Permanent Address: 2003 Peach Tree Street

Austin, Texas 78704

This dissertation was typed by the author.